DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 326 HE 000 093

By-Mayhew, Lewis B.
The Literature of Higher Education, 1967.
American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 67
Note-63p.
Available from-National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Bibliographies, Biographies, *Book Reviews, *Books, Church Related Colleges, *Higher Education, International Education, *Literature Reviews, Negro Education
Identifiers-*1967

More and generally better books on higher education appeared in 1967. A great number of them were concerned with solving problems related to institutionalized religion at a time when the church-related college in the US finds itself confronted with the most serious challenges of its long history. Several better than average institutional histories as well as a few excellent biographies were added to the literature. Although they were not major literary works, several novels revealingly depicted discords within the academic community. Some of the books on Negro education seem to be of such significance that they will affect the future course of events: International education received more than usual attention from authors. Canada emerges as the most important producer of works on higher education with topics ranging from the undergraduate curriculum to governance and graduate productivity. A total of 124 books are reviewed in varying detail. (JS)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

ED0 24326

THE LITERATURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1967

LEWIS B. MAYHEW
Professor of Higher Education
Stanford University

Published by
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

HE000 093

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND
PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-
FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

THE LITERATURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1967

LEWIS B. MAYHEW
Professor of Higher Education
Stanford University

Published by
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Single copy: $2. Quantity orders at the following discounts: 2-9 copies, 10 per cent; 10 or more copies, 20 per cent. Order from and make checks payable to the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

NEA Stock Number: 251-08284

Printed in USA

Portions of this material originally appeared in *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* published by Editorial Projects for Education, Inc.

CONTENTS

History and Biography ... 1

Essays, Social Criticism, and Armchair Analysis ... 9

Types of Institutions ... 17

Students and Student Life ... 22

Religion and Higher Education ... 28

Administration and Governance ... 30

Academic Novels ... 37

Curriculum and Instruction ... 39

Foundations ... 42

A Mixed Lot ... 44

Addendum ... 45

Bibliography ... 53

INTRODUCTION

Certainly in volume and to some extent in quality the output of books about higher education in 1967 represents an advance over previous years. While no work has emerged which seems likely to gain the continuous national attention as did Kerr's The Uses of the University, *or Gardiner's* Excellence, *still a number of gaps in scholarship have been filled and some respectable research reported.*

Each year can be impressionistically categorized, although clearly the categories will scarcely withstand too close analysis. The year of the student is past and if the year 1967 could be assigned a name, it would be called the year of religion. The church-related college in America finds itself confronted with the most serious challenges of its long history, even as does the institutionalized religion. The spate of books reflect the efforts of those concerned to find answers.

But of course there are other strands. It was a good year for history, with several better than average institutional histories being added, as well as a few excellent or almost excellent biographies. Although as a rule novels rarely turn out to be major literary documents, several in 1967 were reasonably well written and deeply revealing of some discords within the academic community. Although the volume was not large, several works on the problems of Negro education seem to be of such major significance as ultimately to affect the course of events. And, possibly in anticipation of things to come, international education received better than average treatment.

In a different vein, Canada emerges as the most important producer of works on higher education. Whether the subject be the undergraduate curriculum, governance, or graduate productivity, the Canadians take top honors. But, to the books themselves.

History and Biography

HENRY WILKINSON BRAGDON has made an important contribution to both personal and institutional history in his *Woodrow Wilson, the Academic Years* (Cambridge: Bellnap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967). He divides the book almost evenly between considering Wilson as a student, first at Princeton, then Virginia, and eventually at Johns Hopkins; his career as teacher at Bryn Mawr, Wesleyan, Hopkins, and Princeton; and lastly his career as college president of Princeton University. Wilson emerges in these pages as in one respect a late bloomer (at the age of 26 he was still dependent on his family for support) but at the same time as a precocious and promising scholar who had high expectations for himself and considerable confidence in his ability to attain his goals. Although Wilson as a student and teacher was frequently in poor health, suffering from among other things chronic dyspepsia, he nonetheless was active both in intellectual extracurricular activities and athletic ones. Among other things, he demonstrated considerable competency as a football coach while he was a young instructor, and showed great skill as a debator while he was a student and later a teacher.

Wilson's intellectual life appears quite consistent, but with some important discontinuities. He was always interested in politics and public affairs both as a theoretician and, of course, ultimately as a practitioner; but from time to time he shifted his interest to the field of history. His interest in politics and public affairs, however, was not legalistic, and he became disenchanted with the study of law at the University of Virginia, leaving there to concentrate on historical studies. In the judgment of the biographer, only one of Wilson's books remains today as an important intellectual contribution—thus in a sense verifying the hypothesis that most intellectuals have but one creative idea during their careers. As for his other scholarly works, they enjoyed good sales but are not regarded generally as having made a lasting impression either in the field of history or of public administration.

Of particular surprise to the reviewer was Wilson's early preoccupation with the actual processes of education and the fact that he had formulated in writing, through a series of articles and speeches, quite definite ideas about the nature of a university, the values of the liberal arts approaches to teaching, before he came to power as president of Princeton.

Wilson's essential pedagogical technique was the lecture, which he developed to a fine point, adopting a style one might hope other professors could follow. For 15 minutes in a formal lecture he would give students the information they should record in their notes; then he would insist they close their notebooks while he spent the remainder of the hour thinking out loud about the complexities of the subject he was discussing. This very preoccupation with the lecture made him a success at Johns Hopkins and later at Princeton, but a less completely well-received teacher of young women at Bryn Mawr.

For those concerned with administration of higher education, the last third of the book is by far the most intriguing, illustrating as it does how

Wilson developed educational ideas such as his plan for the house system, and how he attempted sometimes successfully—and with respect to the houses quite unsuccessfully—to deal with faculty recalcitrants. In the case of his failure, this became the springboard from which he entered active politics. He had already gained a national reputation as a lecturer and writer in journals of opinion; thus, when he became disenchanted with things at Princeton, the public arena appeared a distinct possibility. But while it launched him successfully into politics, it deepened some of the gloomy, more melancholy parts of his personality from which he never fully recovered before his death.

The scholarship in the book appears impeccable, the style of presentation lucid, and the portrayal of Wilson himself finely etched. About the only caveat would be to question whether the biographer might have probed a little bit more deeply into Wilson's relationships with his parents, his deep affection and reliance on his mother, and his profound respect and admiration for his father. These matters are touched on, and yet the reader, as he follows Wilson's career, constantly raises questions about the full significance of parental background. This biographer seems to assign much greater importance to Wilson's enchantment with the fact that he was born, if not bred, a Virginian, than to other elements in his life. The book is well documented and very likely can stand as the definitive treatment of a creative if not seminal thinker about higher education.

If David P. Gardner lives up to the promise of his first book, the nation can anticipate a major scholar of the higher education phenomenon. In *The California Oath Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), he brings together much previously unpublished and unpublishable materials and blends them into an insightful interpretation of one of the several tragic episodes which have plagued the University of California.

In the midst of the hysteria of the McCarthy era, the Board of Regents, upon the recommendation of the president of the University, decreed an addition to the oath of office which all faculty took. Apparently the political climate in the state suggested that the University had to do something to dramatize its policy of denying Communists the right to teach at the University, lest the state legislature inject itself into the internal affairs of the institution.

Then followed a comedy of errors in announcing the new policy to the faculty and deciding how to implement it. By the time the faculty was informed of the Regents' action (almost five months after adoption), the dimension of a potential battle ground existed between some of the faculty and the Board of Regents. At issue was not really the particular matter of the oath. A group of regents, for the most part from Southern California, wanted to impose the power of the regents over the academic senate and force the senate to give formal approval to the policy barring Communists from University service. A group of faculty wished to obtain formal denial of the validity of that policy.

As the controversy progressed, a number of compromises were suggested by the president, by committees of the senate, and by a few of the regents. However, failure of communication, inappropriate timing, and quite clearly unwillingness to compromise on the part of militant groups prevented any of these from being accepted. Eventually a small number of faculty members refused to sign the new oath and the Board of Regents terminated their appointments. This act threw the matter into the hands of the press and ultimately into the courts. Meanwhile, the legislature passed an enactment which required a much more stringent oath from every person serving the state of California—

an oath which all save one or two of the University faculty signed. On the day the State Supreme Court voided the terminations of the Berkeley faculty, it upheld the validity of the new and more rigid oath.

The net effect of the confrontation was three years of upheaval, loss of prestige on the part of the University and the Board of Regents, personal hurt to those who refused to sign, loss of respect for the president, antagonism between a number of campus groups, and in the end injection of the legislature into the affairs of the University through the use of police power.

The author has had the opportunity to talk with many of the participants and to examine most of the critical documents. He handles these materials for the most part deftly, although in mid-passage the long citations from committee proceedings drags on the reader just a bit. This over-all assessment of the episode seems apt and could perhaps with propriety also be applied to the more recent happenings at the same institution. "The history of the conflict is a story of the failure of educated, competent, and allegedly rational human beings bound together in a good cause—the service of truth and knowledge—to resolve their differences without injury to the University as a whole."

This is educational history of high quality. It also is rich case material for the study of administration, of power politics, and the significance of personality in critical decision-making. There seems to be something endemic in the University of California structure which makes such episodes possible. There is also the fundamental split between the northern and southern parts of the state which so often is revealed in decisions about public policy. And the roles of such people as Governor Earl Warren, Professor Clark Kerr, and Charles S. Muscatine seem to this reader at least to predict quite accurately positions they would take in future issues.

Two attractive books suggest just how really changeless higher education is. The first is D. B. Horn's *A Short History of the University of Edinburgh, 1556-1889* (Edinburgh: The University Press, 1967), and the second is Jerrold K. Footlick's *The College Scene Now* (Silver Spring, Md.: The National Observer, 1967).

The Edinburgh book chronicles the creation, rise to eminence, decay, and renaissance of that Scottish institution, and if it did no more would be of scant interest to most who serve American higher education. But the author manages to etch the issues faced by a foreign university in such a way that the universality of educational problems becomes painfully obvious.

From the time actual instruction began in 1583 to the present, the pendulum swung even as it does now on such matters as prescribed or elective curriculum, tuition, faculty agreement and disagreement with the agency of control, prescription of student conduct or individual freedom, and strong, followed by weak presidents. It began as an arts college with a divinity school attached and eventually emerged as a comprehensive university. Originally it was a commuter college, but finally it created residences and attracted students from all over the world.

But, to make the point of the contemporary ring to the history, these observations are made. In the 17th century less than 50 percent of the students graduated in normal time. Some professors dictated their lectures so rapidly that few students paid attention to them. At the beginning of the 18th century the abolition of the regent system enabled students to choose the classes they would attend. A century later a fixed curriculum was again adopted when the free elective system got out of hand. In the 18th century the ability of its professors and the flexibility of its curriculum made Edinburgh a worldwide center of learning which influenced the American experience, but a century later the scepter had slipped to other hands. The arts professors could earn large sums by writing textbooks, and the medical faculty found an increase in income through private practice and consultation. The achievement of the 18th century institution was in part determined by the number of graduates who made outstanding accomplishments: out of 3,500 in the *Directory of National Biography,* 842 came from Oxford, 777 Cambridge, and 343 from Edinburgh, while only 54 finished at St. Andrews.

The town council, which governed the institution, made its most significant contribution by appointing strong professors, but it objected to professors organizing themselves. Additions to the curriculum were justified as a service to local students. Professors tried to obtain better classroom accommodations, and a survey was made to provide a basis for a campus master plan. A fund drive to support a new physical plant proved insufficient when building costs outran subscriptions. Critics pointed out that the lecture system was really not the best way to teach philosophy. As one element of reform in the mid-19th century, independent study was suggested as a remedy for over-preoccupation with formal classes.

If the presentation has a weakness it may be a preoccupation with physical plant, but perhaps that really isn't the fault of the author. The illustrations are well done, the prose, if not exciting, is at least clear. In short compass it is much better institutional history than one finds concerning most American institutions.

The other book is a well-illustrated attempt to show the reality and diversity of contemporary higher education. The chapter concerns reveal the scope of the author's interest and his perception of the collegiate scene. A general setting chapter is followed by ones on student protest, student fun and games, professors, sex on the campus, and profiles of eight different kinds of institutions.

No one can devise a system to measure adequately the quality of American colleges, because they simply are too diverse. The most important single event in the modern history of American higher education was the student protest on the Berkeley campus in 1964. Since that time students have become a major influence in the conduct of higher education in America. But sophomore students still conduct themselves as sophomores—at times. Professors in the major universities have emerged since World War II as among the most significant creatures of American life, but the gap between them and those in weak institutions is still quite great. While there has been a change in campus attitude about sex, the change in actual behavior is not nearly so great as that which took place at the end of World War I. Such are the central arguments of the early chapters then elaborated on in descriptions of Bryn Mawr, Colorado State College, Dartmouth, El Camino, Fordham, Indiana, Vanderbilt, and Wooster. These, while lacking the incisiveness with which the late David Boroff could expose the essence of a college, are still reasonably apt.

The photography is excellent, the reporting respectable, but the entire story is a little too glib and too glamorized. But why should a reporter be expected to capture the reality of the American college or university when the specialists themselves can't.

John Oliver Hall, in an off-set printed book, writes of *Parsons College:*

Nine Years of Change 1955-64 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1966). In 121 pages he does a reasonable job of describing the facts and the rationale of Parsons College. That institution has moved from one of many little-known institutions in the Midwest to such a position that its name may enter the language to describe a certain approach to collegiate education.

Under the leadership of President Millard G. Roberts the college has adopted a core curriculum, a trimester, and team teaching; has a highly salaried faculty; and has gained the enmity of a good section of the academic establishment. By offering a second or third chance to students left in limbo by the current emphasis on selectivity and by creating a program which appealed to such risk students, the college has been able to expand in size. Through improved management practices, curtailed curriculum, and large classes, the college has been able to operate fully on tuition and to recruit a faculty having a high proportion of Ph.D.'s. But there has been a cost. The president has kept power in his own hands and has disturbed some of his faculty. Further, through an ability to coin phrases, he has attracted considerable national attention and has irritated some educators.

All of these are explored in some detail in this obviously privately printed book. Where the author misses, however, is in his failure to ask why Parsons has emerged. And he fails to probe reasons for the controversial character of the institution, for actually every innovation being used has been used successfully elsewhere. The Parsons story is worth recording. The present book will be a good lead into a fuller treatment.

As long as books such as *The Making of a College* (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967) by Franklin Patterson and Charles R. Longsworth can be seriously written, idealism is far from dead in American higher education. The book is an educational credo, a curricular structure, and a plan of action for a new college to open in 1969. Hampshire College has evolved from the Ford-sponsored dreaming of faculties of the four institutions clustered about Amherst, Massachusetts, and the largess of a benefactor who gave six million dollars to put a utopian scheme into operation. The planners, both of the dreaming and of the operational phases, have looked closely at the weaknesses of American higher education and at the innovations, regardless of where found, which have been developed to rectify conditions. Out of these the planners have synthesized a philosophy which stresses the best of the liberal arts tradition in developing students to face a changing world and an eclectic program which can use basic techniques from Hutchins' Chicago and from the Dewey-based Bennington.

Hampshire College will function through a divisional type organization; will offer a modernized version of general education; will be selective, but on varied bases; and will stress individual effort and responsibility, but in a strong community context. Its physical plant will embody the centrality of the library and a learning resources center, separate facilities for the four divisions of knowledge, and a house system which will attempt to maintain the marriage of learning and living. Although utopian in some sense, there is a practical cast to the plan as well. A small college cannot offer intense work in the sciences, nor maintain elaborate specialized library holdings. The answer clearly is cooperation with the four parental institutions, which conceived the idea of an experimenting college.

But there is unrealism, too. The chapter on finance may be making some unwarranted assumptions as to how long increased tuition can support increasing salaries for a relatively small institution. Experience elsewhere has suggested that both increased tuition and increased size will be needed to meet and solve the cost-price squeeze which faces private colleges. Then, too, the expectation that young, highly qualified scholars will gladly come to teach for a few years may have overlooked the pull of professional advance which is related to the large institutions.

As one who has gone through the dreaming and planning of a new institution, this reviewer can only praise the attempt, applaud the recording of the plan, and extend the hand of sympathy when the dream does not quite come true.

An effective study of American higher education as revealed in the life of one man is *The Academic Mind and Reform* by Benjamin G. Rader (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967). Richard T. Ely came from New England stock, took his Ph.D. degree in Germany, absorbed German scholarship and brought it to the United States. Then at Johns Hopkins, Wisconsin, and Columbia he taught several generations of economists, struggled to create learned societies for economics, was involved in several crises over academic freedom, worried about his career and money, and left a bibliography which still influences economic thought. Ely represents a kind of professor which may have vanished. He conducted his basic seminars in his home; his lectures were rambling and his mannerisms were short, sharp, and eccentric. But he influenced the students who came in contact with him and created, if not a new school of economics, certainly a new stance regarding it. One student remarked that one course from Ely would drive a student from economics, but that two would make a lifetime convert.

Beyond doubt Ely is well worth such a biography in his own right; but for the student of higher education the personification of the major developments of the period of the emergence of the American university makes it invaluable. The writing is clear, and the scholarship open to few if any questions. If only the dust jacket had displayed a nude female figure the book could have become a best seller.

Well illustrating the potential for cooperation between the university and the government in solving major national problems is Stephan Grouett's *Manhattan Project: The Untold Story of the Making of the Atomic Bomb* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1967). In detail the author shows how the ideas of research scientists from a number of universities, coupled with industrial experience and an endless reserve of federal dollars, brought about the incredible feat of making operational in just over two years a project which when begun rested on untested theory. Once the army was ordered to develop the atomic bomb and General Lester Groves was assigned to head the efforts, a pattern of chance-taking began to unfold. When scientists could not agree on which of five processes might work, all five were attempted at the same time. A corporation was ordered to build an electric power plant without knowing which cycle of electricity would be used, because the basic operation to generate needed power had not yet been invented. Another factory, tooled to produce a screen of proven value, was dismantled to accommodate one which had never been tested but which seemed to rest on better theory.

Of particular interest are the problems to be experienced when fine research minds from the university campus tried to understand the driving practicality of the military mind for which success in battle is the only ultimate criterion. The remarkable thing is that the Fermis, Comptons, Conants, Szilardis, and Oppenheimers ever were able to work with the Donald Nelsons or Leslie Groves'.

The book forces a reassessment of the roles various men played, according to popular impression, in the development of the bomb. Thus Robert Oppenheimer was selected for his critical task of engineering the bomb itself only after it became clear that the better-known and more respected scientists could not be spared. Edward Teller is always described as a first-rank physicist but his specific contribution never is made explicit.

American industry appears in a good light in the process by which corporations were persuaded to participate even when their chiefs knew that the undertaking might mean the destruction of the corporations. But the central figure which emerges is Groves, who is described as being the one who initiated and carried through the scientific and industrial innovations which the enterprise required.

The book reads well but leaves one with some misgivings. All people just are not as good as the author implies. And the whole undertaking is shown as being a little too pat. It's almost as though the author felt that the answer to the puzzle was there all the time: the pattern just had to be exposed.

An important addition to the historical literature about higher education is the collection of *Some Founding Papers of the University of Illinois,* edited by Richard A. Hatch (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1967). The papers were published in connection with the centennial observance of the University of Illinois and present in ringing tones the excitement and vitality of the land grant idea. They include such things as the address of Newton Bateman at the inauguration of the University, speeches of Jonathan Baldwin Turner who should be considered the father of the land grant idea, the Morrill Act of 1862, early faculty reports on the curriculum, and an annual report of the first president of the University of Illinois.

One cannot help but be impressed by the vision of those men of the 19th century who saw the emerging needs of a democratic and technical society:

> The institution [a state university for the industrial classes] should be open to all classes of students above a fixed age, and for any length of time, whether three months or seven years, and each taught in those particular branches of art which he wished to pursue, and to any extent, more or less. And all should pay their tuition and board bills, in whole or in part, either in money or necessary work on the premises—regard being had to the ability of each.

They believed that this institution, which was to serve all of the people of the state, should be placed once and forever beyond all legislative and ecclesiastical control, for otherwise it would become the tool of the dominant party or else a political football. The Morrill Act provided funds, and the Illinois legislature made it possible for the new university to be located in whatever community won the competition for it—which was Champaign County.

The original faculty pondered the curriculum and provided in remarkably contemporary language for general education courses, "Their main aim [being] to furnish such a liberal education as may best fit students either for the mastery of special courses in the arts or for the general duties of life." Perhaps the only document without a familiar tone is the one indicating that total expenses to students for the year for fees, room rent, fuel, lights, board, washing, and books would be between $100 and $200 a year.

An excellent small addition to the historical literature is Tipton R. Snavely's *The Department of Economics at the University of Virginia 1825-1956* (Charlottesville, Va.: The University Press of Virginia, 1967). Actually it is an intellectual history which focuses on the lives of men who have been involved with the department since the founding of the institution. The author himself has been a member and chairman of the department, hence some of the period overlaps his own tenure.

What the book chronicles is the movement of an instructional unit in an early American type of college to a complex of two schools oriented to research in a comprehensive modern university. What it also makes clear is that off-campus intellectual concerns are not a phenomenon of the jet age. Holders of the chair of economics at Virginia have generally been men of affairs as well as scholars. Some gained their reputation as teachers, some as researchers, and one as an author of basic readers.

The chief flaw of the book is its preoccupation with individuals. It takes some effort to make the organization of the department and the University come clear. Its chief value is one more piece for the historical mosaic which some day will emerge.

Stephen E. Ambrose's *Duty, Honor, Country: A History of West Point* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967) is a reasonably comprehensive over-view of the United States Military Academy. Further, it attempts, sometimes in detail, to show how educational developments were affected by the emerging needs of society. The need for a military academy in the first place was rooted in the changing conception of warfare in the 18th century. The reform of the Academy under Thayer stemmed in part from the social need for engineers and the fact that no other agency was producing them. The decline of the Academy after the Civil War was not unrelated to the fact that the growth of land grant colleges and state universities had taken over terrain once preempted by West Point.

While the author gives some credit to such social and economic forces, he assigns top honors to several men who served as superintendent. Sylvanus Thayer set the Academy and its basic mode of instruction in a form which has lasted to this day. Robert E. Lee reemphasized the Thayer concept and brought the Academy to one of its high points in productivity. Douglas MacArthur dragged the Academy into the 20th century and put it in contact with major educational currents. Indeed, these three almost overshadow the institution itself.

Generally Professor Ambrose seems in command of the materials he uses, although his own notions of the Civil War could jar those who view it or its leaders in a somewhat different light. There are those, for example, who see the Peninsular Campaign of the Civil War as a quite remarkable feat. He sometimes uses secondary sources when primary evidence is available; thus he quotes David Boroff on the academic aptitude of West Point students instead of going directly to the institution.

Generally the writing style is clear, although it sometimes becomes a little wooden. One has the feeling that this is not so much the author's fault as it is the nature of collegiate institutions. They just don't lend themselves to dramatic prose.

Of limited but still important scope is John Sparrow's *Mark Pattison and the Idea of a University* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967). Mark Pattison was what one today would call an intellectual historian who labored at Oxford a lifetime to produce relatively little, but who was part of the effort for English University Reform. The book consists of a refined series of lectures given at Cambridge in 1965. The first several have little direct relevance for the student of higher education, but the essay on the life of a scholar, the essay about Oxford, and the concluding essay on "The Idea of a University" clearly do.

Pattison has become a strong supporter of the college system at Oxford, with its few professors and many tutors—even though many of them were unskilled and almost uneducated. But he became disillusioned when he failed to receive a rectorship of his college. A visit to Germany convinced him that the German university with its emphasis on scholarship was the real future for English higher education. Thus, when he returned to Oxford he sought to destroy the colleges and replace them with nine specialized faculties which would offer advanced tuition to any who would obtain it. Professors were to be appointed because of merit not because of conformity to religious texts. And Oxford was to welcome the sciences. Although Pattison wrote during the late 19th century, the problems with which he wrestled and the solution he suggested have a curiously modern ring.

A large, expensive book is *The Centennial Record of the University of California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967). This thirty-five dollar work records a great deal of factual material about the University and all of its campuses—and a magnificent structure the University is. After a brief historical sketch of the full University, the book then treats each campus with respect to size, physical plant, major programs, research ventures, distinguished faculty, student affairs, and the like. While the book was prepared for internal use, enough copies were printed so that some persons outside the University could obtain copies. As a reference tool for one institution it is excellent; a library of similar works for other institutions would be a boon to scholars of higher education.

Essays, Social Criticism, and Armchair Analysis

PAUL WEISS, Sterling Professor at Yale University, has written a primer on the curriculum called *The Making of Men* (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967). This is a strange book. It is published with praise from Carlos Baker, professor of literature at Princeton, as being filled with ". . . gnomic evil and well seasoned wisdom, astonishingly free of jargon. . . ." But I have my doubts. The book tries to show how education should proceed for infants, children, tweenagers (*sic*), and young adults, and it may be that the author's 35 years as a college teacher qualify him to speak with authority about education and human psychology at all levels of development.

The author's comments on the college curriculum suggest that he believes some form of general or prescribed education is appropriate. Since "it is desirable for the student to come to know the main branches of knowledge . . . ," college should help students become nonempirical, since only such a person is ever at home with what is real. Among the subjects are philosophy, mathematics, art as distinct from the history of art, psychology, anthropology, sociology, religion, government, science, economics, engineering, and athletics. All of this is fine—almost any believer in the liberal arts and sciences could construct a similar grouping with similar justification. The weakness is that the author just does not address himself to the real problem of how to do all of these things in the face of pressures for the college to do so much and to accommodate so many new things.

It could be argued of course that the philosopher's mission is only to indicate an ideal. But this has been so overly done in similar idiom that one can wonder whether one more book is needed.

It is good that a professional philosopher has attempted to speak to education. There have been almost none who would do so since Dewey. But one could wish for a more detailed and systematic effort.

W. M. Spackman has published some precious essays under the title *On the Decay of Humanism* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1967), and one can only wonder why. The dust jacket gives the author credit for originality, caustic wit, and having a high epigrammatic style. This reviewer found the essays to be for the most part without form or structure, and, except for some nicely turned phrases, without real substance. It is true that his criticism of collegiate teaching of literature makes the same valid point others have made, i.e., too much talking about literature and about the lives of authors and their motivations. But this thin thesis scarcely commends the book for general professional reading. And the essay "Cornbread and Circuses," which reflects on an alumni day at Princeton, could be better called "Cute Corn."

Daniel Jenkins' *The Educated Society* (London: Taber and Taber, 1966) is a book filled with provocative insights, probing questions, and some questionable evidence. The argument is that the developed nations have become or are in process of becoming educated societies, with perhaps a third of the total adult population engaged in educational activities as an essential calling. This fact has stemmed from a number of sources, most important of which has been the triumph of technology based upon the achievement of science. Science, technology, and industrialization, with the attendant prosperity, are the real revolutionary forces of the modern world, alongside of which communism and nationalism fade in significance.

But if the educated society is to be a vital and growing thing, major changes in higher education as well as in other institutions of society are needed. First, the postulate must be warranted that an educated society requires a common culture. This then will require that the high and mass cultures must be brought into more congenial alignment. This is an especially difficult task, for the market for the industrialized society is a mass market with a strong tendency to be provided trivia. Thus a high culture is essential to counteract trivialization which comes from mass culture, but it must be based on genuine popular or mass culture.

Secondly, since the most highly educated in an educated society will have great power, it is essential that such people be led away from the defects of the life of scholarship. The first of these is self-righteousness which enables the articulate scholar to justify himself and expose the shortcomings of others. Second is a particular brand of triviality which stems from people leading sheltered lives, attempting to be objective in limited fields. It is the triviality which makes so many academic discords the tempest-in-the-teapot sort. And derivative of these is the indecisive mess about the things of this world. Academic people like to discuss that which is most discussable, rather than that which is most important.

If the academic community is to develop in such a way as will bring out its real strengths while minimizing its weaknesses, it must forge fresh links to the rest of society so that its efforts are always listed and checked by life outside of the university campus. Among other things this implies a new look at "pure" liberal arts or "pure" research. Very likely neither ever has existed nor could exist. But such a movement requires a moral act. In the past the moral conditions have been supplied by religion. While some evils have been perpetuated by religious faiths, the great burden of evidence is that the religious impetus has been good for education. It is in the liberal, Protestant tradition that the greatest potentiality lies. Tradition allows great freedom without also emphasizing a sterile cultural relativism. The agency within the university which can help lead to this moral decision is not the faculty, but the much-maligned administration who are generally ". . . the most right-minded about true academic aims, as they are the most hard working of people. . . ."

The developed western society is pluralistic. But what makes pluralism work is that most members of the society agree on a few basic postulates. It is the responsibility of higher education to insure that communication about these few continues and grows.

Fully two-thirds of the book deals with American as well as with English higher education. In the last section the author treats more specifically with English school concerns. But the earlier portion deserves a wide hearing in the United States. It is the thoughtful, yet unpretentious sort of essay one would wish to see more frequently.

Dorothy M. Knoell's *Toward Educational Opportunity for All* (Albany: Office of the Executive Dean for Two-Year Colleges, State University of New York, 1967), presents a variety of information to suggest that junior colleges can assist in solving the educational problems of disadvantaged groups living in the central city. The book stemmed from a suggestion made by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller that perhaps a new kind of college was needed which would serve such youth. The State University, in an effort to establish whether or not such was the case, commissioned Dr. Knoell's study.

The report reveals some surprises. Technical workers represent only 2.5 percent of the employed labor force in New York State, hence crash programs to prepare such workers would not have much effect on disadvantaged youth. High school graduation is of value to the male white students, for they quickly find work and establish themselves, but there is scant difference between the Negro dropout or Negro high school graduate with respect to employment. Thus, it is difficult to convince Negro youth of the value of remaining in school. A large proportion of disadvantaged youth claim they would not attend college even if they could. Hence, they demonstrate little frustration at their present educational situation. But they do want jobs and see the need for some sort of training.

Perhaps the most important finding and recommendation is that considerable increase in training programs for service occupations is needed and that the State University should look to the present two-year colleges to expand opportunity before considering seriously the creation of a new type of institution. The weakest part of a really strong book is the section which, through use of analogy and example, suggests what community colleges might do if they followed the patterns of California and Florida. The sheer existence of programs doesn't establish that junior colleges in those areas are really providing service to actual people. The troubles of Hunters Point and Watts are still too fresh to allow such a positive conclusion.

Harold Fall's *Controversy in American Education* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1967) seems to be one of the growing category of manufactured rather than written books. It is an anthology extended, one must assume, to exemplify the editor's theory of phases of conflict which society must experience and to provide materials by which "those who have anything to do with education in America today have a solemn responsibility to reflect on the revolutionary changes going on about them and to help prepare the children and youth to meet an ever-changing future."

These are commendable purposes and the editor has selected some provocative essays. He uses Kenneth E. Boulding's description of the great transformation of society, as well as essays on learning to live with science and cybernation. And he presents some of the more widely known theorists on the curriculum (Ralph Tyler) and on adolescents (James S. Coleman). But the market which will buy the book seems vague. It might be used as extra reading for a class in the social foundations of education. Or it could be a group of readings for a somewhat specialized course in freshman English. But it doesn't seem the sort of book the general student of higher education would read.

Julius A. Stratton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, tries to say something of the nature of education, of science of the educated man, and of the great selective universities of this land in *Science and the Educated Man* (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967), which brings together a number of his speeches. Generally the speeches reveal a man who has some feeling for history (almost every speech links the occasion with some event in the past), considerable awe for MIT, a belief in engineering, and a faith that work in the humanities and social sciences is appropriate for a science-oriented institute.

Beyond doubt President Stratton knows his institution. Further, he knows much about the recent role of government in the development of university research. Several of the best essays tell in detail the events since World War II which have led to the new government-education power elite. But since the speeches were usually short, the sort to be given at ceremonial affairs, President Stratton rarely goes below the level of generality to develop his educational ideas. Thus one can sagely agree that "We must allow no gulf to grow between scientists and the great body of educated people. The education of scientists is now too serious a matter to remain wholly the concern of the profession itself." Yet one misses some guidelines which can help one's thinking along the direction suggested. Presidents who wish to leave their verbal mark on the profession of education should perhaps use the technique adopted by Presidents Kerr and Perkins of long, well-developed essays, rather than editing the short statements presidents must make as titular leaders of the establishment.

It is a rare delight to find a work in the social sciences which is cleanly and simply written; so frequently one must wade through obtuse belaboring of the obvious. In *Education, Interaction and Social Change* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1967), Harold L. Hodgkinson has summarized most of the germinal theories and considerable of the empirical evidence from sociology and social psychology which bears on contemporary problems of education. From the book's cover, the quotes which introduce the sections, the phrasing of argument, and the sly injection of the message, one experiences brightness.

What Dean Hodgkinson does is present the major theories such as role concept, bureaucratic structure, functionalism, social stratification, and social mobility, together with research evidence about creativity, collegiate impact on values, and the quest for community as prelude and support for a consistent philosophy of education. The college has a responsibility for helping students establish and make consistent the various roles which they must expect to play. The Hawthorne Effect, which troubles pure researchers, is viewed as a valuable device which education must constantly contrive. The responsibility of education is to transform the formal curriculum so that it is a genuine alternative to the fun culture. The decline of the Protestant ethic is a part of present student unrest which educators have been slow to recognize. A society which increasingly lives in the present, but which demands its young to live for the future, is in for some severe shocks.

Education must use the processes of identification, role playing, and the like to assist students to mature in a time of major revolutions. These are the revolutions of cybernation, increase in leisure time, changes in the family, and the evolution of a world perspective which must be accommodated. These all act to make education more widely dispersed and to enrich lower levels of education. The result will surely be more transitional types of institutions and more conflict of lower levels of education. The Berkeley-type protest thus can be expected to happen much more frequently in secondary schools.

Education, Interaction and Social Change is clearly not a general sociology of education nor a full-blown philosophy of education. It is, however, a pragmatic attempt to use both philosophy and sociology to help plan a more rational educational effort.

Two slim volumes, one of speeches and published papers of the dean of education of the University of Arizona, and one of papers delivered at a conference, have been published (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1967). In *Contemporary Issues in American Education,* F. Robert Paulsen (ed), a series of papers are presented without any clear theme, except that the writers try to deal with important issues. But while there is no theme, most of the papers seem to elaborate what is at once an early American thesis, as well as the most recent formulation of what might be called a psychology of affluence. This, simply stated, is that human beings and especially children do have the potentiality for change and development, and that no child should really be deemed as beyond the reach of the school. So optimistic are these essays that they almost use the idiom of the 18th century with such expressions as, "It seems that man *can* control his own life and that the scientific method is the chief instrument to enable him to do so," or,

> All things we desire
> And strive so hard to reach
> Lie freshly, like blossoms, furled
> In the heart of the child we teach.

The second, and less satisfying book is a collection of papers prepared by Mr. Paulsen and published under the title *American Education: Challenges and Images.* It is unsatisfying not because the papers are not well written and contain some interesting insights about American life—indeed they do—the weakness lies rather in claiming too much for education. One frequently has the feeling that education is open to so much criticism simply because its spokesmen claim to do more than any social institution can. Thus the sentence, "Education is the best means we know to accomplish the individual and societal goals considered important and imperative in the world today," sets the tone for the book. And the thesis is continued in subsequent papers with such statements as, "Education must remain the bulwark against the irrational action of those men who may be controlled by passion or motivated by selfish goals," or "The success of American education must be observed in the attempt to develop the concept of universal education with all of its lofty goals," or "Those of us in the classrooms today have been given a real opportunity to bring the idea and prospects of the 'good life' to those whom we teach." As sermons these are fine. But do they help better understand what education is really all about?

Earl H. Brill has written *Sex Is Dead and Other Postmortems* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1967), a collection of essays containing fairly commonsense observations about the contemporary cultural scene, especially the higher educational one. The title essay argues that the present outward preoccupation with sex may mean that real sexual vigor is gone and will probably stay gone until people realize it's no longer necessary to fight the Victorian mind. The author also wonders if the great universities would be great if people stopped thinking they were. In spite of much talk of the establishment, all groups seem to feel they are outside the center of power, which must exist elsewhere. Conversation about how difficult it is to get into college could well be a self-fulfilling prophecy. In spite of what they say, student radicals are not about to reject the middle class and can be expected to return to the fold and really support the valid tenets of that style. One would suspect that *Sex is Dead* would clearly discriminate between those younger and those older than 30. The older group would approve and the younger would see Mr. Brill as oh so square.

The summer 1967 issue of *Daedalus* continues the series of outstanding contributions to American opinion. "Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress" results from the work of the Commission on the Year 2000 of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. It presents edited transcriptions of several meetings of the Commission and a series of prepared papers all designed to suggest the direction which the world and American society seem to be moving.

And the papers provide fascinating reading. For the next 30 years western society will be increasingly sensate, bourgeois, scientific and technologic, industrialized, affluent, urbanized, literate, and with faith in agents of change which will increase the tempo of change. These of course are predictions, but they are also values which people might wish to modify. There is the Faustian dilemma of wanting to know the future, but at the same time being able to alter it. Some feel that reasonably safe predictions can be made about the rate and in general the nature of technological change by establishing the parameters within which invention will likely take place. But this assumes that technological change is a rational and convergent system. Clearly the efforts to predict must be made, but people must also be prepared for the unexpected.

Within such serious methodological limitations nonetheless, a number of authors try to describe the outlines of facets of life in 2000. There will be large university cities in which the university will be even more closely allied to surrounding industry than is presently true along Route 128 in Boston or along the San Francisco peninsula. Since man has not changed much biologically in over 100,000 years, the odds are that he won't in the next 33 years. However, it will be possible to control and modify human personality. It is now in fact possible to alter behavior by drugs and neurosurgical intervention. Since these techniques will become more refined, the public must become more alert to detect abuses. It will be on youth that some of the most serious strains of adjustment will fall. There is a tendency for youth to fall back on conventional styles of behavior after the storms of adolescence. But when those conventional styles are shifting so rapidly, what will youth be able to fall back to? As agencies seek to control or to help people adjust to changed conditions, there will clearly be increased threats to privacy. Employers, a welfare government, and the availability of techniques with which to invade privacy all indicate the threat. But counter measures are possible. However, the practices of education are not likely to change, for the problem of educators—how to get students to want to learn—is still far from solved.

As for other trends, the nation state will still be the principal political and social vehicle. The trends in communication observable today will be operating in 2000. And life will be more complex with more problems than it has today.

The papers are thoughtful. While one can sympathize with the editors in wanting to share the opinions of participants in the meeting of the commission, a better vehicle than editing the comments themselves should have been possible.

The contributors seem generally to have been well selected, but one wonders about the fact that only one is presently located outside the Washington-New York-Boston area. Surely including people doing work on genetics in the Midwestern universities or social planning in several of the Western centers might have strengthened the volume.

Nevitt Sanford has spelled out his own philosophy of education in *Where Colleges Fail* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., 1967). He finds that colleges have sought an overly restricted concept of excellence and in doing so have limited the fullest development of students. Rather, the undergraduate college should opt as its prime mission to help students develop into mature, socially responsible adults who are comfortable in whatever role they wish to place themselves. While education should not replace the clinic, there are many lessons which education can learn from counseling and from therapy. "Planning an educational environment must be guided by some theory of personality as well as by social theory." His own theory of personality suggests that at each level of college the developmental needs of students should be considered and ways be prepared for the next stage of development. This is especially critical at the senior year when faculty may be led to feel students have arrived. Actually seniors face an enormous next development phase and want and need help in preparing for it.

This is a warm and wise book, written in the informal style in which Sanford speaks. He draws largely from his work at Vassar, Berkeley, and Stanford, but at least in this reviewer's estimate his insights have general application. And it is an optimistic book: ". . . developmental change can occur at any time of life: each of us, at whatever age, has unexpressed potentialities."

Alvin M. Weinberg's *Reflections on Big Science* (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967) is a collection of speeches and essays given over a period of several years. Although normally such collections are disjointed, this one has considerable cohesion and can actually be read as a book. Dr. Weinberg is the research director and director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and is convinced that large sums of public money placed in large-scale research projects is not only defensible but essential to the national well being. But before its full blessings can be realized, society must solve the population problem and also solve the information problem which has resulted in a proliferation of complexity. These are much more critical than, say, the production of energy which can be solved within the next few years.

Society, he feels, will continue to support science but it can't support all science, hence it must develop criteria both to compare science and nonscience investments and investments between sciences. As between sciences he would ask: is the field ready for exploitation? Are the people in the field really competent? And does the field interact closely with another field? At the present he sees the biomedical field as the most likely prospect for rapid expansion.

For higher education his most relevant ideas have to do with big and little science. It is quite possible that the university is ill-suited to house big science and should concentrate its energies on teaching and on small science. Big science involves team effort which is contrary to the individualistic tendencies of college professors. His observation of the need for a cadre of mature scholars who will devote their careers to interpreting the works of others indicates a new goal for American graduate education.

These essays read well and are tightly reasoned. His calm view reminds one of Conant when he was pondering the role of science in the society and before he attempted to solve all of the educational problems of society.

Alan F. Westin's *Privacy and Freedom* (New York: Atheneum, 1967) establishes in considerable detail human need for privacy, as well as human curiosity and social need for surveillance. It describes how the American experience has given peculiar form to these. The author shows how rapid technological advances in listening, observing, and recording; significant advances in psychological testing; and major improvements in recording and analyzing information have given those who wish or feel they need to invade privacy the tools with which to work.

During the early part of the post-World War II decade the public seemed relatively unaware or unconcerned by the growing power of government, industry, education, and private agencies to spy on private sectors of human life. Even the courts seemed unsure of what a proper constitutional stance should be. However, from the end of the McCarthy era to the present, public reaction has grown so that currently serious debate is possible and serious ethical, legal, and legislative actions are being or can be taken.

The book describes the battery of devices which are now or will be available to observe people, extending from radio transmitters in the form of coat buttons to pills which make the human body an electronic instrument. Painted lines along a wall, well camouflaged, replace the need for obvious wiring, and telephone-activated tape recorders can be started in one's home from any place in the world.

The case for the need to invade privacy seems to be made most clearly by federal bureaucrats such as Internal Revenue Service officers who in spite of agency prohibitions continue to bug and resort to other techniques; by police officers who feel crime is so serious as to justify any means to control it, and by psychologists who believe the need to solve human or social problems is so great that again the ends-means argument is resolved.

The case against is also made by strange bed-fellows. Both doctrinaire liberals and conservatives have made common war on surveillance. Indeed, one conservative called for one more law which would outlaw the sale of all devices which could be used to invade a person's privacy.

But a complex society does seem to limit an individual's rights. In some way public policy will be established which will protect the person and the society at new levels of sophistication.

Innovations in Higher Education, edited by Kenneth J. Hallam (Baltimore: Towson State College, 1966), reports on one of the USOE-sponsored conference on innovation according to types of institutions. The general point of view of the book is suggested by the principal speakers. Harold Taylor of course finds the need for reform in teaching critical; William Marvel wants international education increasingly added to the undergraduate curriculum; Louis Bright sees the industry-originated team approach to research applied to education; and Lewis Mayhew sees some virtue in general education.

But while the ideas of the main speakers are generally well known, it is probably good that they be directed to a specific problem for a specific sort of institution. There has been too much speculation about education in general. The conference report does force one to think much more specifically.

Lewis B. Mayhew's (ed.) *Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades* (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1967) takes the stand that the period since World War II has seen more crucial revolutions than any other time in history. Higher education reflects in essence responses to those revolutions. The articles included are intended to indicate the revolutions, the responses, and the likely future.

Types of Institutions

JOANNE T. HARTLEY has edited *Dialogue on Higher Education* (Claremont, Calif.: The Claremont Colleges, 1966). The central administrative officers, some faculty and some Board members of the Claremont Colleges visited Oxford University and engaged in a three-day seminar with Oxford officials. The purpose was to examine higher education issues as met by the British and the American tradition. The seminars were tape recorded and the book represents an edited version of that record. Although the title contains the word dialogue, the result is more commentary on British education than American. But that is as it should be, for the Americans were seeking to understand the British system.

The heart of the Oxford system is the self-contained college which screens carefully the students it accepts and then applies the tutorial method to develop in those students the ability to think clearly. It is an expensive method which has produced some of the most outstanding leaders in British history. But it currently is being reexamined in the light of increased demands for higher education and definite pressures for more graduate education. Whether the traditional forms of undergraduate education will persist is not known. But if it does change, it will do so slowly, for the college faculties believe in the system and they do have control over the destinies of their relatively small institutions.

Oxford University is a collection of small private colleges which receive the bulk of their support from the government. These funds are made available through the University Grant Committee which serves as a buffer between the universities of Britain and its government. The Committee allocates operating funds on a five-year basis. After funds are appropriated, each institution has full charge of their expenditure, subject only to visitation and review of the conduct of the university every five years.

Although British and American institutions are in many ways dissimilar, they all currently face many of the same problems. The issues of centralized or decentralized libraries, the problem of creating laboratory space, the pressure of numbers, and the peculiar problems of graduate education perplex educators on both sides of the Atlantic. The treatment of those issues in the conversation reported in this volume is descriptive rather than analytical. As such it makes interesting reading. The editing is well done, but I doubt that Allan Cartter really fancies himself a representative of Great Britain.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education published *Teacher Education and the New Media* (Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1967), by Herbert Schueler, Gerald S. Lesser, and Allen L. Dobbins. This is a report of a USOE-funded review of the literature, which begins with a broad discussion of trends in teacher education, and which contains an abundance of the usual clichés about teacher traits, a speculative statement of how the new media might be used, and then a rather detailed, and quite devastating review of how little we know. The refreshing part of the book lies in an elaboration of the thesis that "The cultural lag between research and application in education is commonly deplored. In the case of the effects of new media research and experimentation upon applications in teacher education, however, this lag is, for a change, to be welcomed."

The 20th yearbook of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education entitled *Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education* (Washington, D. C.: AACTE, 1967) is an attractive, soft-covered book reflecting the proceedings of the 1967 annual meeting. The list of speakers is impressive, even though some of their thoughts are not, or at least they are not particularly new. Father Donovan spoke to the theme of tradition and innovation, and opined that not all that was old or new was especially good or bad. Harry S. Broudy seems to be saying that teaching effectiveness can more nearly be gauged by an expert with considerable clinical experience than by a newcomer. And Harold Taylor expresses his present preoccupation that teaching is a high form of national service especially in the international area. In addition to providing the major speeches, the book contains edited dialogue between panel members discussing the major speeches, and a few other topics. These are hard to follow—one wonders only why such things are included.

That the junior college is coming to be big business is illustrated by the growing number of publications about it. A number of these are contained in Richard D. Bass' and Roberta Anderson's *Community Junior College: A Bibliography* (Corvallis, Ore.: Division of Continuing Education of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1967). The listing appears reasonably comprehensive, although it is not annotated. The only question one might raise is whether some indication should be given as to whether items were explicitly concerned with junior colleges. While most titles reveal that they are, a few, including some authored by this reviewer, do not and are not.

The American Council on Education serves the profession well with its directories of collegiate institutions. An example is the seventh edition of

American Junior Colleges published Sept. 5, 1967. This describes in some detail 751 two-year institutions, public for the most part. As compared with a number of other guides, the profiles of individual institutions are well written and long enough so that guidance officers can learn enough about a school to counsel with students. Had the directory been limited to such material, a reviewer would simply need to sample the descriptions to test for validity, comment favorably, and leave the matter. However, the editor has elected to preface the material with an introductory section under the heading of trends, which purports to describe the evolution of the junior college movement. Here the reviewer must consider what is appropriate comment for an association of scholarly institutions to make. Generally the factual information as to first colleges, the kinds of programs offered, the states causing the greatest growth of junior colleges, are consistent with other accounts in the literature about junior college education. But this section seems more of a political document than a scholarly statement. It contains unnecessary innuendo, a good bit of questionable hyperbole, and some statistics, which while true, may be placed in a misleading context. Should not the book indicate whether the 1967 enrollment of one and one-half million students is full- or part-time, full-time equivalent, day or evening? The questioning character of the statement, "*For private junior college administrations,* (italics mine) the role of this type of institution is a vital and significant one," is contrasted with the strong, "These colleges recognize that if they are to broaden opportunity for college experience, programs must relate to the needs, aspirations, abilities, and interests of large numbers of people," which is used in connection with public institutions. In commenting on the potential of the University of West Florida as an upper-division university, would not a qualifying statement regarding the success or failure of Florida Atlantic which attempted the same thing be appropriate? What is the criterion of excellence which allows that word to be used to describe the Dallas Junior College District? Why in a book of this sort should there be such a political statement, calling for categorical aid for a type of institution, as, "There is growing interest, however, in looking at the special aims and purposes of the junior colleges in relationship to possible major support programs at the federal level"? In the light of the emergence of the federally supported research universities, the tremendous changes in medical education, the renovation of secondary curricula, the development of universities in developing countries, what support is there for the statement that the junior college is ". . . the most noteworthy educational development of this century"?

There are small examples, but the first section contains enough to be classed as an editorial rather than an analysis or good reporting. The junior college would seem to be be a strong enough institution not to need this subtle sort of rhetoric.

The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions has released *Accredited Institutions of Higher Education* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, September 1967). It lists and briefly describes all institutions accredited by the six regional accrediting agencies, and thus becomes an important reference tool. So also is Clarence E. Lovejoy's *Lovejoy's College Guide 1967* (New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1967). As an introductory aid to parents or students seeking information about colleges, the book is perhaps the best on the market. More sophisticated insights, however, require the use of more sophisticated tools. The information presented seems to be up-to-date and accurate, hence can be trusted.

Emory W. Rarig has compiled *The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1966), and it is what it purports to be. The brief annotations do give the gist of the books and articles written, but the bibliographer may be overawed by the presumed eminence of the writers whose works he cites. The work should be useful for graduate students for at least several years, but one wonders why the rush to hard cover with a bibliography for a field whose apologists call the fastest growing in higher education.

Then there is another collection of papers. Doesn't anyone write full books anymore? Edward Manier and Jack Houck edited *Academic Freedom and the Catholic University* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Tides Publishing Co., 1967). Generally the papers seem to be exploring the question of whether a religiously related institution can be a true university and can tolerate true academic freedom. Perhaps the most common-sense answer was given in one paper which said yes, because the market place won't allow Catholic universities any other course than academic freedom. But other ramifications of the problem were explored. The AAUP conception of academic freedom is elaborated. The gradual move toward acceptance that a person can be committed to both a religion and a body of knowledge and still keep them apart is described. And the gradual evolution of Catholic institutions from a limited provincial function to a national one is clearly emphasized. This is far from the last word on the subject, but the fact that the conference was held on a Catholic campus and the fact that demands were made for full academic freedom is proof that true academic freedom can exist on a Catholic campus which is a true university.

Howard Glennerster's *Graduate Study* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967) is a study of graduate work at the London School of Economics. In order to plot the future of that institution, its faculty resorted to the most unusual device of trying to find out what was actually going on. What was discovered was a situation quite familiar to American students of higher education. In the past ten years the student mix has shifted from in favor of undergraduates to a present balance on the side of graduate education. As knowledge has increased, the amount of material to be taught has created dislocations in the curriculum. There is considerable wastage among graduate students, which has come to be of real concern, particularly since each year sees larger and larger numbers of applicants for graduate work. This fact has forced a change in admissions standards from being loosely applied by major professors to a more centralized system so that some quality control is possible. But maintaining quality control is difficult, because no truly effective predictor of success in graduate school or subsequent research productivity has as yet been found. One can only hope that some American graduate schools attempt similar sorts of study. The findings are not surprising, but proof is always welcome.

Robert Hassenger has edited *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), and has included some of the clearest statements of issues facing Catholic education to have been published recently. Hassenger himself is a young Chicago-trained sociologist who for the moment has selected his own church's educational efforts as a field of study. His general orientation he reveals in the summary chapter in which he opines that there can be Catholic higher education as evidenced by a few institutions of near distinguished characters, that Catholic higher education is not going to fade from the American scene at least for some decades, and that there is a significant educational role for such institutions if they will but assume it—the Catholic university should be a manifestation of the church learning.

Others of the contributors vary somewhat from his position. Thus, one judges that Catholic institutions can become great only when they do as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton did—become nondenominational. Another will say that since Catholic institutions differ so much from each other, the question really is, which of the many institutions should and which will survive.

An important part of the book is the presentation of psychometric and sociological data about college students in Catholic colleges. While these do reveal some major differences between Catholic and non-Catholic institutions, the discussions imply as great or greater differences within the Catholic orbit. Catholic college students do seem to be more authoritarian, more status oriented, more inclined to go to the power professions than to scholarship.

Several of the chapters deal with much-publicized controversy such as the strike at St. John's College and the dismissal of Professor Kearns at Georgetown. A weakness here is that protagonists have been allowed to write as scholars about matters in which they were deeply and personally involved. And even one research report is similarly suspect because the researcher did not feel that the institution was taking his impact study seriously enough.

But the total impact of the book is scholarly. The historical sketch does link the forms Catholic higher education has taken, not with any divine purpose, but with the realities of an American society which used religious orders to accomplish a needed social mission. The case study material is insightful—indeed it is almost too revealing to those familiar with many individual institutions. And for the first time the full range of still limited research on students is brought within the covers of one book. Perhaps as his next task editor Hassenger should attempt full book treatment of his own.

Manning M. Pattillo, Jr. and Donald M. Mackenzie's *Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967) reports on a study authorized and supported by the Danforth Foundation. The study rests on a base of deep sympathy for church-related colleges. But this predisposition does not deter the authors from candor and criticalness as they ponder their evidence. Religious bodies have been important sources and forces in creating and maintaining higher education in America, and for preserving a body of liberal and Christian learning as the central core of the national culture. But now church-related colleges find themselves in a minority position in relation to tax-supported institutions. It is how to remain viable in such a position that presents them with their greatest danger and possibly their greatest opportunity.

Generally these colleges include some of the nation's strongest and weakest institutions. This leads the authors to one of their central conclusions which is ". . . that there is nothing inherent in church relationship that either assures or precludes quality in a college or university. Thus, some colleges send large proportions of their graduates into the learned professions; some colleges have as well-trained faculty and pay as high salaries as do the strongest secular institutions; and some colleges are innovating with their educational programs in ways which could set styles for the rest of higher education. But others seem so moribund as to almost plead for death. All, however, are struggling to make articulate the exact meaning of church-relatedness in a society in which the church itself is unsure of its role or its meaning. To be sure, students in church-related colleges possess a larger store of religious information than do students at secular institutions, but they fail generally to demonstrate a vital religious involvement in other regards.

If church-related colleges are to prosper, several reforms seem essential. Greater experimentation, better long-range planning, revised administrative structure, greater economies of operation, better faculty recruitment and training, and avoidance of proliferation of unneeded colleges are all suggested. Of course, the same injunctions could be made to secular institutions. But the authors do not really answer, nor perhaps can they, the central dilemma of church colleges. True, they should be devoted to teaching, they should be offering a balanced program in the liberal arts and sciences, and they should be helping students develop a reasoned framework of belief. But the same problems perplex secular colleges. Perhaps the authors' contention that the church-related college should become the critic and the leader of the church holds the key. The church is in a period of intense crisis. Possibly church-related colleges can become the source for a new theology more atune to the modern world. Whether church-related colleges accept and use the wise advice presented them in this book, they and we should be grateful to the authors for helping this type of institution to know itself in all of its ideals and imperfections.

Students and Student Life

IN A GAEL GREENE sort of way, Richard Goldstein has written *1 in 7 Drugs on the Campus* (New York: Walker & Co., 1967). Through interviews, reviews of press clippings, and general readings, the young author has tried to understand the dimensions of drug use on the campus. He finds that large numbers of young people do use marijuana, LSD, and other drugs, but that the current boom is less with addictive drugs than with the nonaddictive ones. Further, he finds that collegiate administrators are reluctant to accept this as a fact, and even those who will face reality don't know what to do about it. When pressure is applied, use of drugs increases, for students hear about the matter and decide to try it themselves. While the folkways suggest that drug users are the long-haired beats, actually nice boys and girls use drugs, too, and in increasing numbers. Drugs are used most widely on the west and east coasts and least in the South: there alcohol is the release students seek. Although law enforcement officers contend that use of nonaddictive drugs leads to use of the more sinister ones, they are wrong with respect to the college scene. Their figures are acquired in lower-class areas of large cities where people move to drugs for completely different motives than do college students. Although medical authority is divided, a reasonable number of doctors feel that nonaddictive drugs are harmful. But the author in balance seems to say that certainly marijuana is less harmful than tobacco or alcohol.

Mervin B. Freedman's *The College Experience* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967) is difficult to assess. It contains much wisdom and considerable information, but it more properly should have been called "The College Experience of Women," for the author draws so deeply on his research at Vassar and more recent inquiries about women. It also could well have included the limitation in the title that it deals with some important, but by no means all, components of the college experience. Thus, the curriculum, the realities of admission, the bureaucratic functioning of colleges, and classroom experiences are given slight treatment, if considered at all.

Nonetheless, it is a major addition to the literature and presents an optimistic view at a time when Cassandras seem to flourish. Briefly, the author finds the contemporary college students generally quite well adjusted and as having experienced few of the much-vaunted crises of adolescence. During the college years these students grow in a generally more liberal direction and enter an adult life which they find satisfying. In place of being over-preoccupied with sex, these students do not reveal a significant shift in sexual patterns from those in the 1920's and 1930's. Perhaps the major change has been a diminishing of feelings of guilt about whatever sexual activities in which they engage. Nor is the identity crisis as great as some writers would suggest. Students learn who they are fairly early, and the college experience helps them confirm their notions. This is not to say that important changes do not take place in college. Freedman feels that in some respects the college years are as important as the years of infancy which concerned Freud.

Otto Butz, who created a mild storm a few years ago with his *Unsilent Generation,* has used a similar technique to produce *To Make A Difference* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967). He asked a number of students at San Francisco State to deliver autobiographical lectures about themselves and their education, and then published a few of these to indicate the tone of current student feeling—and of present thinking. Professor Butz feels that discontent among members of the contemporary college generation is aimed at the four problems of racial discrimination, poverty, American foreign policy, and the current version of the American way of life. And he believes students want to solve these problems through love.

The spokesmen he uses to elaborate these points could scarcely be called youths, for they average almost 24 years of age; but certainly could be described as introspective and from time to time articulate. One, in prose which seems to derive from Whitman's poetry, is searching for a new hero who would be the archetype of America, who ". . . requires no corrals, who seeks and enjoys freedom of being at ease among ourselves. . . . He's new, not yet standing, moving his slow thighs, but he's here." Another, frightened by an electrical storm, seems to have had a religious conversion which in some way convinced him of a growing dissatisfaction with the old capitalistic ethic. His way out was to withdraw unless he demonstrated. Another, somewhat more pragmatic young man, sees the society-wide problem as being how to use resources to build a more desirable society. When students find they can't do this—at least not all at once—their frustration leads to protest. Still another used a sexual encounter as the device for clarifying a religious position. And a last utopian feels that America must set her educational ideals high or else perish.

There is much good in this book, although the student sample is clearly distorted. All of us concerned with education should listen, at least with a third area, to what students are saying. And collections such as this one bring a wealth of remarks to us.

Samuel Gorowitz's (ed.) *Freedom and Order in the University* (Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1967) reproduces the papers and some of the discussion of a conference held to deal with what to do about student freedom. And one must assume that the participants did grapple with the problem—although their efforts were not unlike a 14-year-old boy trying to neck for the first time.

Paul Goodman led off the festivities with his usual well-written utopian brand of nonsense. The ideal is to eliminate all structure, all rules, and all restraints, and let the kindly hearted teachers and the pure-hearted students educate each other. Walter P. Metzger more responsibly tries to outline academic freedom as seen by professors, and then attempts to show how this limited concept could be extended to students. But, as one of the participants observed, the freedoms he would extend are those of most relevance to professors, which leave largely untouched important concerns of students. John R. Searle, drawing on his Berkeley experience, seems to suggest that wise officials, carefully interpreting a few regulations, can insure that students have all the freedom they can use. The only rub, as he sees his own scheme, is that students feel that's not enough, and the public won't stand for so much freedom. By far the most profound statement was that of Sanford H. Kadish and it makes the book well worthwhile. He accepts the fact that some rules are necessary. The trick is to decide which are, and then to define their application in the light of the mission of the university. His formulation would allow the university to take action in cases of cheating or selling drugs, but not in plotting in private on campus, off-campus criminal action. The bibliography of recent works on the subject of student freedom is a dividend.

College Student Profiles (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1967) presents in tabular form characteristics such as aptitude, backgrounds, vocational goals, and attitudinal orientation for students in different types of institutions in each of the six different regions of the nation. Information upon which the profiles are based is obtained in connection with the American College Testing Program, which also allows individual institutions to obtain similar data for internal use or comparison with regional or national norms.

The book provides empirical data to support the previously clinically established fact of diversity among institutions of higher education. It supports the belief that virtually every high school graduate in the United States could find a college appropriate for him if financial and geographic barriers were removed. Generally the book contains few surprises. Thus two-year colleges attract a somewhat less able student body than do the various types of four-year institutions. The students' preparation for college varies somewhat according to the region from which they come. Those from the South are slightly less able than those from the Midwest. Most students attend college in their home state, with more out-of-state students attending two- than four-year institutions. One somewhat surprising finding is that nonacademic accomplishment is distributed among students attending different types of institutions in the same pattern as academic accomplishment and aptitude. The greater accomplishment is found in Ph.D. degree granting institutions. Surprising that is, in the sense that other ACTP reports have shown the relative independence of academic and nonacademic accomplishment.

The book, thus, is one more significant contribution to the growing precision by which selection of college can be made. One hopes every high school guidance person ponders well the message.

Another significant contribution is B. Alden Thresher's *College Admissions and the Public Interest* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966). In thoughtful, well-reasoned chapters, the former director of admissions at MIT seeks to clarify the great sorting process which is college admissions, and to suggest ways by which it can be made more rational. While popular belief has it that college admissions is a screening based on intellectual skills, it is actually an interaction of sociological forces of many sorts. The roots of higher education lie deep within the needs and aspirations of the population. Social class, geography, the needs of society for certain kinds of people, all are involved. At one time higher education was something which happened to a relatively small proportion of the age group, but then after World War II a new conception took hold. It was discovered that the nation was losing thousands of talented people who did not go to college, not through financial limitations alone, but because the idea of college just was not within their cultural environment. Following this came a search for talent movement to meet the changing and increasing demand of the employment market. Coincident with this came an awareness of how a college education could aid in upward social mobility. These have conspired to make higher education facilities scarce, which in turn has prompted institutions to become selective frequently for noneducational reasons.

Generally admissions can be viewed from about three different levels. The first is the simplest and involves students looking for a college which is appropriate for them. The second, slightly more complex, is reflected by colleges trying to sort, for their own purposes, from among students who apply. It is level three, which involves the entire admissions process and which if used might even deny an individual institution the right to do only what it believes is good for it, which the author wants to develop. This level three would accept as a good thing the variety of American colleges, and varieties of talents and needs, and seek to order these with guidance officers serving to mediate forces of supply and demand. Currently a movement toward a system's approach to admissions is being made through attempts to understand what is happening. Eventually the study of admissions will merge with broader studies of higher education, for eventually those in higher education will be almost the entire age group. When that time comes, the author believes we shall have important new departures in the teaching learning process, and an even richer variety of institutional types and organizational forces. Oh, if he were only right.

Charles F. Westoff and Raymond H. Patvin have written *College Women and Fertility Values* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), and have exploded one more myth about the impact of a college education. Through a study of some 15,000 freshmen and college women at 40 institutions, the authors attempt to find whether type of college attended is related to fertility aspirations. In general, plans for number of children, the spacing of children, and prevention of conception seem to be related to other factors than college attendance. The one big exception is that Catholic women who attended nondenominational colleges seem to have modified their ideas about fertility. The significant generalization is that "In all probability the values about family and children are developed long before the college age, a speculation that is reinforced by the persistence of a correlation between the number of children desired and the number of siblings."

Esther Lloyd-Jones and Herman A. Estrin edited *The American Student and His College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967), and again make their most important contribution an archival one. Using news stories, analyses, speeches, and other material originally presented in the popular press, the editors have preserved some quite good fugitive literature. They divide the collection into such rubrics as the new breed, the campus, the campus culture, pressures, sex activities, and student rights and responsibilities.

If the articles truly outline the dimensions of student concern (one doesn't know what criteria for balance were used), some new guidelines for collegiate administration are suggested. The two largest sections deal with students' reactions to certain parts of an affluent culture and with sexual behavior. Almost nothing is reported concerning what one could presume the central functions of college life to be—teaching and the curriculum. Either the press doesn't report such things, the editors judged them unimportant, or students really are not upset about the education part of their higher educational experience.

Another made book rather than of the written variety is Louis Menashe and Ronald Radosh's (eds.) *Teach-in U.S.A.* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967). Using documents from the teach-ins, reports of speeches, speeches, and recollections of participants, the editors try to capture the spirit of the 1965 academic protest of the war in Viet Nam. They obviously believe that the academic community had been denied a voice in a national policy which intervened in a clearly civil war, and that the teach-ins represented a desperate attempt to regain that voice. But they do seriously seek to reflect the full spectrum of opinion, from the somewhat maudlin effusions of young professors who saw in the teach-ins a rejuvenation of an entire generation, to the Victorian fulminations of a Russell Kirk.

Aside from the obvious virtue of serving as first-class source material for an episode in American intellectual history, the book makes two other important contributions. The first is to reveal, through reproducing the full correspondence, the waspish side of McGeorge Bundy. His letters to professors at Washington University and the University of Michigan suggest an impatience ill suited for a public officer charged with delicate policy. The second contribution is to underscore through actual presentation how both the administration and its critics fail to listen to the other side and to respond to points made. So many of the charges and countercharges remind one of small children arguing, "T'is so," "No, t'aint."

Earl McGrath continues to edit volumes at a rate which astonishes us poor mortals, who must read them because their content is generally so relevant. The most recent example is *The Liberal Arts College's Responsibility for the Individual Student* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966). It presents the papers given at a workshop, and these all reflect what might be called the progressive, student development point of view. The old pros are all represented with good examples of their thought: Farnsworth, Sanford, Pace, to name just a few. This should be required reading for all deans of students, especially the elderly female who fills such a role. And the book would not hurt professors.

Freedom of Expression by E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966) is a research report describing how a number of components of the academic community feel about various student freedoms, and how frequently they are exercised. The research tool was the president of each of perhaps 800 campuses who solicited questionnaire opinions from colleagues and students, and reported the results to the central study staff for subsequent analysis.

The questionnaire attempted to obtain information about the general climate for academic freedom and an indication as to which exercise of freedom would or would not be tolerated on a given campus. These data were then analyzed according to type of institution and several other variables.

The results generally were not surprising, although it is good to have empirical verification of previously held insights. Thus private universities, large public universities, and nonsectarian liberal arts colleges were most free in theory and had experienced the largest amounts of exercise of freedom. Small public universities, technical institutes, and Protestant liberal arts colleges reflected the average amount of freedom for all of higher education. Catholic universities, Catholic colleges, and teachers colleges were significantly less free.

It is possible to find in the results examples of institutions in which virtually more of the freedoms were cheerfully given, to examples of institutions taking pride in the fact that virtually all were insured. Thus an administrator seeking norms to help him establish a policy must be disappointed. But if one takes pride in diversity of higher education, the results should be pleasing. They support J. S. Mills' belief that ". . . the practical question, where to place the limits—how to make the fitting adjustment between individual independence and social control—is a subject on which nearly everything remains to be done."

The brief historical sketch of academic freedom which is presented is sound and of about the proper length. One doesn't really need to go back to the Greeks to establish a subject of inquiry. Also welcome is the generally humane understanding of student problems which has long characterized the senior author's stance. The writing is clear and the statistics don't intrude. To paraphrase Henry Higgins, "Why can't other studies be like this?"

A bothersome book is Eli Ginzberg and Alice M. Yohalem's *Educated American Women: Self-Portraits* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966). The data for the book came from a project on the conservation of human resources in the form of 311 life histories of women who had received some form of award, scholarship, or fellowship from Columbia University. The authors classify women into categories of planners, reacters, adapters, and the unsettled. They then illustrate each of these with a few self-portraits supplied by 26 different women.

What they find is that some women faced with desires for a career, marriage, or both, decide what it is they want and then take steps to achieve it, accepting the cost. Others change goals in mid-life and proceed rationally in the new direction. Still others seem to adapt to circumstances as they arise, but do so without losing a sense of personal identity. A last group seem always at odds with the forces which operate on them and don't seem to realize how to order their lives.

All of this seems reasonable, but the question is, does such a categorization really need to be elaborated and illustrated by a book. The profiles reveal that women suffer conflict problems not experienced by men, but they don't suggest ways by which education could help women resolve them. The profiles do present interesting insights of women, the forces which motivate them; but they don't suggest theories or hypotheses for future research. The profiles present some self-conscious women who are reasonably articulate, but they don't allow the reader to like them very much.

Bernice W. Einstein has prepared a *Guide to Success In College* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1967), and it is just that. She has collected questions new college students most frequently ask, recorded problems they most commonly encounter, and then attempts to provide answers and suggestions. The information seems reasonably sound, but one can guess that the didactic style will not attract many readers. More's the pity.

Religion and Higher Education

IN AN EFFORT to provide context for the American search for compromise in the church-state issue, Sister M. Raymond McLaughlen has written *Religious Education and The State* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967). Sister clearly believes that the constitutional provision regarding the establishment of religion was not always the wall between church and state which it is currently considered to be. That more recent interpretation stemmed from anti-Catholic bias in the 19th century. That compromises are possible she shows through analysis of other European and Commonwealth nations.

Were it not for the flaw of Paul Goodman's introduction, Albert H. Friedlander's edited *Never Trust a God Over 30* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) would be contemporary intellectual history of high order. But Goodman's disdain for facts provides an unfortunate mind set from which to approach the book. For example, his generalization that the contemporary college student entering the ministry is probably more intellectual and spirited than the average is contradicted by such books as the *Campus Ministry*. But the bad taste is quickly dispelled. The editor's discussion of the reaction of Jewish students to *The Deputy* is moving. William Starr's elaboration of the thesis that the mood of the new theology and the new campus is radical in the sense of asking root questions reflects an intellect of high order. Henry W. Malcolm's discussion of the young college radicals avoids the sentimentality so many treatments reflect Chaplain Cannon's *Epilogue* could well be a model credo for the campus ministry. Says he, "We accept the emergence of radical pluralism as a welcome change from the domination of culture by a single ideology or religion." . . . "We share the assumption that our ministry is within and to the total university."

Nathan M. Pusey and Charles L. Taylor's *Ministry for Tomorrow* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1967) is a committee report on theological education in the Episcopal Church. The Christian church presently faces the most severe challenges of its two thousand-year history. Modern culture is urban, scientific, and secular, and the church has yet to evolve good ways of confronting these facts. Then, too, there are profound changes in the conditions under which people live, which the church must recognize and accommodate. The population explosion, industrialization, availability of leisure, new conceptions of health and the family, and the danger of depersonalization of life are facts with which the church must deal—but the question is how. Theology should be the means. And contemporary theology has experienced some success. It is concentrating more on Christology. It has become ecumenical in character and it has become more the business of laymen. But unless the church can change its ways even more and unless it can make its theology even more vital, it will not attract the best minds of the times. Theological education has not succeeded well recently.

It is not pointing students toward the parish ministry. Almost a third of all students do not intend to enter that calling. It does not attract the best students. A majority have undergraduate records of C+ or lower. Episcopalian seminaries attract more students from other denominations than from the Episcopal church itself. Students who elect seminary training frequently exhibit pronounced neurotic tendencies and may be using the seminary to solve personal problems. While theological faculties are generally well trained and have good working conditions, students criticize them for aridity and lack of relevance in their teaching. Library holdings in seminaries are being improved, but the rate is too slow. And the curriculum has become too fixed and does not have needed increments of social and behavioral sciences, or of field work. A summary of student complaints about their curriculum is not dissimilar from complaints about higher education generally. Too many courses are presented, too many one- and two-hour courses, too much past-oriented course work; too little attention is paid to student motivation; and teaching is too detached.

As to the future, theological seminaries must first answer the question posed to every professional school, which is the reason for its existence. A professional school is not a graduate school, yet there are strong forces seeking to make it so. The seminary should accept as its primary mission preparation for the ministry. And the conceptions of the ministry must conform to the changes in society.

The last portion of the report is by far the most significant i.e., that which deals with the problem of theological education. The first portion, which probes society and theology, is really not discourse but a rosary-like string of sometimes relevant and sometimes quite irrelevant quotations from learned or sacred sources. The most insightful portion deals with the nature of professional education.

The Study of Religion in College and University (New York: Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches, 1967) is a report of a consultation held in January 1967 and consists of the papers delivered and a transcript of discussion of the documents. The entire series is premised on the point of view expressed in the lead paper, i.e., there is growing interest in religion, religious topics, and religious speakers and courses on the nation's college and university campuses. This is not a revival in the sense of the great awakening. Rather, it reflects the interest of a bright, serious-minded, and troubled student generation in finding some relevant answers to their questions. The discussion based on this premise explored the significance of the fact that religion increasingly is something which can be studied in public institutions. This of course is not an unmixed blessing, for the secular universities can outbid the seminaries and parishes for religiously trained and oriented scholars. But it does reflect a major effort on the part of today's church to change from denominationalism to ecumenicity.

As the university involves itself more and more in the study of religion, the church must reconsider what is churchmanship and what is the difference between a university's concern with religion and that of the church.

The consultation beyond doubt provided the opportunity for a number of people concerned with religion in higher education to raise and discuss some vexing issues. The discourse might have been more pointed had the participants not been so homogenized. No serious skeptic or critic of religion was involved, nor anyone concerned with higher education generally. The results would have been better for the profession had more discordant voices been included.

George F. Donovan edited *Vatican Council II: Its Challenge to Education* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967), which presents the papers delivered at a workshop probing the subject and summaries of workshop sessions. The workshop session dealing with higher education was designed to help answer the fundamental question, "What is the desired end product of a Catholic institution of higher learning?" Generally the answers given were not particularly surprising or particularly helpful. The most important objective is the full development of the human person. Colleges should develop in young people the ability to judge rightly, the ability to foster a sense of values, and the desire to act responsibly. These are fine. But the workshop only raised such crucial questions as, what role should the student or faculty member play in the establishment of institutional policy, and what about student impatience with mediocrity and token religion?

The book represents an attempt, but too parochial still, to be of much value to all of higher education.

Administration and Governance

HADLEY CANTRIL is probably a distinguished scholar. His credentials are impressive and his bibliography almost monumental. But his book, *The Human Dimension: Experiences in Policy Research* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1967), should not add to his reputation. It is a chatty, name-dropping description of how public opinion sampling either has or could have saved the United States from blunders in foreign or domestic policy. Thus, if only officers in the Government had listened, the Bay of Pigs need not have happened and the Dominican insurrection would have been prevented. Because Franklin D. Roosevelt did use reports on public opinion, he was able to mesh his leadership with what the people would follow. An accurate reading of German public opinion provided a propaganda base from which the German people were convinced to bring pressure on the air force to try to stop Allied bombing in the months before the invasion of Europe: a development the Americans clearly wanted, for it gave them a chance to destroy German fighter strength before the Normandy invasion.

The modesty of the whole presentation is revealed in the author's statement that, "It has been the burden of this book that it is possible for the United States to determine to a far greater extent than has been realized, either by our government or our social sciences, which form this reaction takes. Moreover, that we can largely determine the kind of reaction by means of the psychological tools I have described."

Now one can't really quarrel with attempts to use social science research tools. But the title of the book seems a little pretentious for the unvalidated claims of success which the author describes. Perhaps the tool of social science should be used to study the effectiveness of the social sciences.

British education comes in for serious criticism in one of the essays comprising W. John Minter's (ed.) *Campus and Capitol* (Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966). In the concluding essay, T. R. McConnell argues that unless higher education responds to the needs of society, the political arm will step in and either reform existing structures or create new ones. British universities had been slow in responding and are now being forced to expand, to create new graduate programs, and to make their operation more efficient. The University Grant Committee is also being forced to examine even more critically than before the bases of requests for funds, and to use funds as a means of forcing change on conservative faculties.

McConnell's insights are always penetrating, but he does refer perhaps too frequently to the experiences of California, Buffalo, and the University of Minnesota—all places in which he has served.

As for the rest of the volume, with one exception the essays are generally not as helpful as have been those in previous proceedings of the summer workshops. Perhaps this is because so much emotion is involved in the problems of higher education and government. Thus Gould wants formal guarantees for university autonomy and Morse wants higher education to assume leadership over its own destiny. The one exception is Harrington's clear analysis of The Compact for Education. He sees it as a potential force for good or ill, but at present it is less effective than when it was simply an idea in the mind of Conant, supported with Gardner's money, and given organizational expression by Sanford. The Compact will only become significant if it limits its activities to a few things done well.

The bibliography on state coordination is a well-done and useful addition to the volume.

A. J. Brumbaugh has written *Establishing New Senior Colleges* (Research Monograph No. 12, Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967). It appears to this reviewer to be one of the weaker of the series, as well as one of the weaker statements which Brumbaugh has made. This is unfortunate, because he has done such excellent work on other subjects. Drawing on his vast knowledge, as well as on some intimate experiences with the creation of new institutions in Florida, the author gives an overly generalized statement of steps and principles which should be followed. The first reaction is that if a new president of a to-be-created university found these ideas new—heaven help the institution. If the new president were qualified to lead, he would have known everything the book suggests.

A peculiar book is *Power Presidents and Professors* by N. J. Demerath, Richard W. Stephens, and R. R. Taylor (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967). It purports to be a social scientific analysis of the power structure of a modern American university. Actually it is a perplexing book. The first few chapters are so full of opinion, pseudo fact, and the results of a few studies that it could be dangerous through misleading readers as to what is known. The analysis of the evolution of the modern university with its four purposes of teaching, research, service, and provision of trained manpower is orthodox enough. So for that matter is the notation of conflicting, bureaucratic, and collegial trends within its structure. But the discussion of the presidency bothers. How is it established that most trustees desire small boards; that a majority of board members are wary of the nonacademic man; that there is a clear shift toward decentralization to college level of most development activities; that the primary sources of income are parents, alumni foundations, industrial corporations, and federal aid to education (in the major universities federal grants are likely to represent well over half of all income); that university finance depends on alumni groups; and that presidents do not belong to councils or boards of accrediting associations?

Actually, had the author made clear that the chapters on the president really were based upon what some presidents thought was true, they would have served a useful summarizing purpose.

But after the false early starts, the case study of the changes in administration of the University of North Carolina, the descriptive analysis of departmental structure, and the elaboration of a theory of administration which can blend bureaucratic structure and a collegial, or I would prefer corporate faculty, attitude make worthwhile contributions to the literature.

Two relatively superficial books deal with a most complicated matter. John Caffrey and Charles J. Mosmann have prepared *Computers On Campus* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967) as a guide to college presidents regarding the potential of this new educational, research, and administrative instrument. Recognizing that presidents need to know about computers, but have precious little time to digest a complex treatment, the authors describe in simple words and pictures what a computer is, what its uses might be, how much it costs, and how colleges get started in the computer business. And to help the president talk with those who have a more sophisticated knowledge, a glossary and brief bibliography are provided.

The Council is to be congratulated for this effort, provided of course that the little knowledge being dangerous syndrome does not operate.

While there is reason for simplicity in a book directed to college presidents, no such reason exists to justify a similar level in *The Computer in American Education,* edited by Dan W. Bushnell and Dwight W. Allen (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1967). The book consists of papers delivered at a conference on computers in education held in 1965. While several of the papers do present in detail actual descriptions of computer systems in operation or do discuss in realistic terms the difficulties which exist, too many of them are Utopian statements of what education ought to be, and how, in the future, the computer can make it so.

But there are many redeeming virtues. Patrick Suppes, who ought to know, shows that computers do not offer a panacea for problems of instruction. Allan Ellis notes the potential and limitations of data banks and where they presently are to be found. And the bibliography and list of conferences on the computer are helpful. Overly simplified, the contribution of the book lies in its discussion of actual computer work. It is the material on the nature of education and the need for reform which seems arid and stale.

M. M. Chambers makes many important contributions to higher education, one of the most valuable of which is his periodic summaries of legal decisions. In *The Colleges and the Courts 1962-1966* (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers Inc., 1967), he digests decisions from a period in which the nature of higher education is undergoing rapid change. Higher education is increasingly judged not to be just a privilege, but a right essential in modern life. Student rights, with a few reversals, are more and more receiving protection from the courts. Although there are still battles to be fought, litigation continues to favor protecting the rights of Negroes to be admitted to tax-supported universities and colleges, and to deny institutions recourse to delaying actions. As has been true of other periods, the varied facets of student life become involved in court action, although no clear-cut trends are detectible. Just as student rights are receiving greater protection, so are faculty rights. While at least one case seems to limit the utility of a tenure provision, other cases imply that tenure does make considerable difference. And loyalty oaths may be on their way out, helped along by a series of recent court decisions.

As institutions change their character through merger and joining state systems, a number of new problems arise which call for judicial review. Generally decisions support the possibility of merger of former private colleges with state ones. And as finances become even more important to higher education in the future, it is to be expected that cases involving taxes, benefaction, and expenditure of funds should increase. At least this seems to be true for the period covered by this book.

This book is such an excellent resource that it should be in the library of every president or student of higher education. Without it those of us who work the same field as does Chambers would have a difficult time of it.

Louis Joughin has done an important service for the profession by editing *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967). The book is, as its title states, a handbook dealing briefly with the nature of the AAUP's concern for academic freedom and tenure, presenting the procedures by which the AAUP can be brought into a situation, and listing in detail some of the relevant statements of policy which the AAUP has enunciated. All of these are located in other places: it is simply good that they be brought together between one set of covers. It is in part II that the handbook becomes more creative by reproducing a number of letters emanating from the central office, as well as working papers developed about academic freedom or developed for the AAUP. One which seemed particularly sensible was the essay "On Some Misconceptions Concerning Academic Freedom" by Fritz Machlup of Princeton University. Using almost a Thomistic framework of questionable postulates followed by reasoned analysis, Machlup shows that the concept of academic freedom is a distinct thing, not derivative from general freedom of speech which imposes equally discreet responsibilities on the individual and the institution. He describes what this reviewer has in general found to be true, that the persons frequently involved in academic freedom controversies are somewhat disreputable characters, but whose rights to academic freedom must be supported to the last if the principles are going to mean anything at all.

Beyond question, every president of a collegiate institution should have a copy of this handbook on his professional bookshelf, and it really wouldn't do most professors any harm to review the stances which their Association has taken.

Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967) is a report of a task force on the nature of academic governance at selected institutions, and an indication of what might be an ideal form of involvement. At the outset it should be indicated that the report probably reflects a bias, for the task force was comprised only of professors. While their experience clearly fitted them to observe the phenomenon of governance—individual relations, anthropology, economics, law, and political science—the fact that no administrators were involved is probably a weakness.

The findings, however, seem responsible and not altogether unexpected. A main source of growing faculty discontent is a desire to participate in policy determination. Effective systems of campus governance should be built around the concept of shared responsibility and shared authority over such issues as educational policy, economic resources, and role and scope issues. Participation should be at several levels, and can use both internal and external organization. Shared authority seems better than the use of sanction or arbitration by third parties. The academic senate seems the most effective device for shared authority. Adversary techniques are needed most frequently when the administration has failed to establish effective internal organization.

It is good that the issues of academic governance are being brought into the open and discussed with techniques peculiar to the academy. But there should be other formal statements reflective of other points of view. One is a little uneasy that faculties of underdeveloped institutions which produce much of the current faculty unrest may take some of the suggestions as license to create a faculty-dominated structure which in the end must fail simply because faculties really lack the techniques to implement policy. A faculty senate without administrator membership is likely to suggest policy which cannot be made operative.

A book which still should be reported is *Governments and the University* (Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, 1966) by William Mansfield Cooper and others. It contains essays on external governance of British, Canadian, and American higher education. The essays, although prepared by different authors, generally advance the thesis that higher education has become so expensive, complex, and significant that government involvement in its governance is inevitable. Although details differ, all three nations are seeking some structure which will mediate between institution and government. State coordinating committees in the United States and the University Grants Committee in the U. K. are really sisters under the skin. This reviewer just wishes he had had the book before starting a study of the future of governance.

Sam P. Wiggins' *Higher Education in the South* (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1966) is an attempt to understand the South and its higher education through the use of a variety of data. "The concern has been less for scholarly respectability than for an accurate perception of conditions that will not sit still long enough to get a time exposure of them."

Professor Wiggins and his associate are Southerners; they approach their subject with sympathy yet with candor. They see the South as a unique area, sometimes ill-defined, which is struggling over the conflicting stances of regionalism (which assumes superiority of the nation) and sectionalism (which does not). The South has had to reconcile a specific Protestant religiosity, a high degree of family solidarity, and of course the American dilemma of two races with the realities of the contemporary world. It has made great strides, but it currently faces the task of retreating from gains thus made or of consolidating its gains with definite facts of the social fabric.

Every aspect of higher education must contend with several main issues. Many Southerners, white and Negro, are unready for higher education. Higher education must accommodate to two races. Higher education is expensive and the South has been backward economically in the past. Higher education in the South is more under the control of the political arm and of a particular religious orthodoxy. Higher education must ultimately cope with deteriorating family structures.

The author makes a good case for each of these, save one, as being uniquely a problem of the South. However, while he obviously believes that family deterioration is a critical element of Southern problems, he doesn't make a case for it, with the exception of the well-known breakdown of Negro family life.

The general argument follows a definite format. First, such issues as the general education curriculum, student activities, admissions, faculty problems, and duties of presidents are described as they impinge on all of higher education. Then, after establishing the validity of these for the South, an attempt is made to show the additional ramifications which face southern colleges and universities. At the end of each section the author presents a series of recommendations which range from quite specific tasks which could be accomplished, to exhortations for a general shift in social style.

The author would like to see new opportunity in people's colleges created which could deal in a realistic way with the poor preparation of many Southern students. Such a school might well be a three-year community college which would use the first year for remedial work. He would like to see church-related colleges make their Christianity effective in dealing with such problems as the relationship of the races. And he would like to see professors make more operative their teaching responsibilities. Few could quarrel with these. But he then advances an atypical elitist notion when he would exempt the universities from great concern for remediation. Also, he argues that perhaps a number of the weakest Negro colleges should be allowed to die. On each of these points there is strong counter argument. One is that Southern higher education must accept, for at least a generation, its task of upgrading an entire people, and to do this, all institutions must be concerned with remediation. Another new point is that even the weakest Negro institutions are better than nothing, and to allow any one to die would be to do a disservice to some Negro youth.

But these are simply points about which there can be genuine professional disagreement. The book represents an honest attempt to explode a most complicated subject, and it comes close to succeeding.

One other book should be mentioned, but without extended comment. It reflects a growing segment of the literature which attempts to bring fugitive literature between book covers. Earl J. McGrath's *Selected Issues in College Administration* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967), presents the papers and speeches given at a seminar for college presidents. As with such made books, some of the speeches were good and some reflect just rehash of quite stale ideas. But the material, good and bad, is now available.

Little by little conventional wisdom about higher education is being validated or rejected by empirical studies. A case of validation is Fred Luthan's *The Faculty Promotion Process* (Iowa City: Bureau of Business and Economic Research, 1957). Although the title should have indicated that the book deals only with schools of business, the book does present some evidence about what has generally been suspected. The central administration believe that the processes and criteria by which professors are promoted are generally understood, whether they have been explicitly formulated or not.

But professors are more than a little convinced that more caprice than rationality is generally involved. The mode of inquiry was questionnaire plus interview, with adequate safeguards of sampling within a limited population. The early theoretical section consists of rather disjointed quotes from the three categories of people who have written largely about administration. The presentation of results is generally clear, and the conclusions and recommendations are about as one would expect. The author, however, is a little more prone to overstate things about which little is known. It is probably not true that ". . . in most universities today, the faculties have the major voice in selecting their administrators." Nevertheless, the book makes its contribution. But many more similar small studies are still needed.

David G. Brown's *The Mobile Professors* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967) represents a scholarly support for a good bit of the conventional wisdom about the academic marketplace, as well as an occasional refutation of some elements of belief. Specifically, it is an attempt, through instruments of economic theory and analysis, to demonstrate how professors move from job to job, what motivates them, and what are the limitations to the free functioning of the market. It is predicated on the notion that academic labor markets serve the important role of allocating a scarce and valuable resource, and it reaches the conclusion that this market functions imperfectly. The research itself inquired into the job hunting, finding, and leaving practices of 10,312 full-time faculty members who were new to their institution in 1963-64.

Generally, the report assumes that shortages of academic faculties will continue into the mid-1970's at least, and that these shortages force institutions either to tolerate a deterioration of the quality of faculty, or to increase job attractiveness through higher salaries, higher rank, and improved direct and indirect fringe benefits.

As to the findings, most were not surprising, although it is good to have generalization documented. Weak institutions are more apt to respond to a short market with a deterioration of faculty. As September approaches, institutions are less selective about the credentials of new appointments. Job-switching is for the most part voluntary. Weaker institutions have higher turnover among faculty than strong institutions. Since World War II the market has been active for all institutions, but for different reasons. Small colleges must live with high turnover, and large state institutions must expand each year. Since typically professors don't resign until they have a new job, identifying job hunters is difficult. And the job search proceeds in rather quiet ways.

But there are a few surprises. Overall the influence of tenure upon turnover rates does not appear high. Nor do particular types of retirement systems seem directly related to turnover. To a considerable extent professors fail to accept the offers from the institutions which would offer them the highest salary or rank.

The book supports the idea that there is no one market, but a series of submarkets defined in several different ways. For example, there is the prestige school submarket. These institutions produce the students who are then appointed to other similar institutions and who, when they move, must either stay in the prestige orbit or drop to a lower market, never to return.

It would be possible to continue this listing of generalizations, but enough have been given to suggest the substance of the book. It is a valuable book. It provides some normative data which should help institutions assess their own problems. And it makes a series of recommendations which, while thoughtful and for the most part well-conceived, don't stem especially out of the research. I happen to believe that employers should recruit actively and advertise openly, but I doubt any research can validate the belief any more than it can the advice to maintain a credential file. It is this portion of the book which must be judged least satisfying. But such small irk is a modest price to pay for a real contribution, which the book is.

Academic Novels

FOR THE NOVEL DEPARTMENT Willard Temple has produced *That Old College Try* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1967). The story is simple, but the message important and complex. An average-achieving daughter of a middle class family attempts to gain admission to college. The heavenly seven type such as Vassar rejected her because of her only average SAT scores and high school record. The less selective finishing school type rejected her because her state's quota was filled. The state university at first rejected her because her grade point average dropped a fraction of a point below the legislated minimum, and then when she raised it, rejected her because housing was unavailable. After several months of work and living in her own apartment, a mild love affair, and seeing other youngsters get ready to go off to college, she applied and was accepted at one of the Midwestern liberal arts colleges which suddenly had a vacancy. As she struggled to adjust to these blows to her ego, and of course the egos of her parents, her younger brother and sister began to change their own values. Younger brother saw that early effort was needed if he was to enter college when he was ready, and younger, brighter sister discovered that school alone was not the end of life.

The problems of the young are etched in real enough terms. The language and the situations in the public schools, however, don't ring true. Tutoring in high school biology probably should have been changed to tutoring in SMSG mathematics.

The first few pages drag, and the prose is clearly not vital. But one quickly is caught up in a realization that the author is describing a madness of our time. One almost is disappointed that this family, seeing the ridiculous condition of college admissions, ended convinced that the bachelor's degree was worth it. The father, who was a college dropout, should have known better.

A first novel written by a young man (he is 22) is a heavy attempt to satirize the current competitive milieu of highly selective collegiate institutions. The plot of *No Transfer* by Stephen Walton (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1967), concerns students at Modern University, a highly selective, permissive institution, which allows students to do as they wish, so long as their grades are maintained. But let the grades slip and the institution's self-discipline system operates through the instrumentality of a guillotine. One underachieving student activates the instrument to impress upon another the supreme error of academic sloth. Aside from those times when the entire student body must assemble to watch justice be carried out, life at Modern University reflects some kind of Utopia. Professors are good, students may drink in or out of their rooms, all girls may take the pill if they desire, and interroom visitation is not only allowed but outright encouraged. Aside from these, which consume most of the students' time, there are classes to attend, assignments to be mastered, coffee to be drunk, football games to be attended, and publications to be edited. These are all done by wooden sorts of characters who remain from the first page to the last just names. It's hard to visualize any of them, except to conjure up stereotypic pictures of all-American girls and boys. If the picture of college life which Mr. Walton depicts is what students see, and this doesn't include the heavy-handed lesson the guillotine is supposed to symbolize, then one must be sure that a joyless hedonism is the lot of upper middle class youth.

Phoebe and Todhunter Ballard have written *The Man Who Stole a University* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967). The authors are professional writers who have turned their attention to the university through the form of a novel. Their skill as writers is considerably greater than their insight into academic governance. Briefly, the story is about a private university which, after serious financial problems, appoints a young executive from the oil industry to restore prosperity. He does so chiefly as a means to political aspirations which he has long held. But in the process he earns the enmity of the chairman of the board of trustees. This enmity is crystallized when the chairman of the board terminates the appointment of the president's administrative assistant for not having published. When the president protests, the chairman fires him, and he accepts the decision. However, the president then moves the college students, faculty, and records to a vacant military installation and resumes educational effort. Eventually the old board is forced out, the campus is restored, and the young president, having accomplished his mission, elects not to enter politics, but to return to the oil industry. The authors have apparently gathered newspaper headlines as to what is bothering the university and have thrown all of these elements into their effort. Thus, there is sex, student activism, academic freedom, communism, and use of drugs and alcohol. It's a pity, though, that the authors didn't take the time to find out how universities do function. A chairman of a board doesn't fire a president without at least a meeting of an executive committee. Administrative officers are not usually held to a publish or perish rule, nor are faculty to such a demand that the publication must be a book. And moving a full campus within a few days strains the imagination of anyone who has ever tried to move a library over a summer vacation. It is a well-written story, but not really about a university.

Robert H. Rimmer describes *The Harrad Experiment* (New York: Bantam Books, 1966). Harrad is a residential college located in Cambridge, Mass., which recruits top quality students, provides them with one course each year, residential facilities, and enrollment in whichever of the other prestige schools in the region students wish to attend. The school is funded with a foundation grant and premised on the notion that if human emotion were trained to be free, much more creative people would result. Since sexual repression is such an important restraint on human feeling, the school sets out to eradicate conventional morality which is repressive. The student body is evenly selected between the sexes, and roommates are initially assigned in boy-girl pairs in the full expectation that sexual experimentation and intercourse will be the rule. Students may change roommates in the hope that gradually they will discover that sexual attractiveness of several different people for each other does not deny monogamy, nor need it result in jealousy.

The story is told through the journals of six students who made it through the school and into the contemporary American Nirvana—graduate school. During their four years they read a carefully selected bibliography which ranged from sex manuals to self-psychologies. They experimented with sex, related in various ways with parents, and turned into rather mature young adults. While the book overly stresses description of sexual activity, it does have an important redeeming educational message, which briefly is that restraints can be loosened without bringing the world down around us.

Curriculum and Instruction

NORMALLY A COMMITTEE report resembles a cross between cat, camel, and cougar, but *Undergraduate Instruction in Arts and Science,* Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Instruction in the Faculty of Arts and Science (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967) is an exception. Perhaps it's the fact that British and Canadian education stress literacy so much. Or perhaps it's because of a strain of pragmatism in Canadian education, but this report emerges as a clear, no nonsense, no jargon analysis of weaknesses in college teaching and simple ways by which the condition could be rectified. Without reference to any systematic body of educational theory or educational language, the Committee finds such things as professors lecture too much, with the result that lectures are not very creative and serve to keep students from doing the more important independent work on their own. The Committee finds that both students and faculty have so many formal confrontations in a given week that academic life itself seems fragmented, and students don't have time for the solid hours of study and contemplation which should characterize a collegiate experience. The Committee also finds that of the many purposes which could be advanced to support lectures, the transmission of information purpose is about the only one professors typically achieve, and that one could be better achieved through referring students to books. But the Committee also took to task other practices. Laboratories so frequently offered dull and pedestrian ways of gaining information which could be obtained more easily elsewhere. Discussions turn out to be miniature lectures.

The recommendations regarding the improving of teaching and learning, the structure of the curriculum, and organization of colleges are equally common sense and wise. A faculty should place a limit on the number of lectures a professor could give in any one week. Or where teaching assistants are essential, a faculty could develop ways for appraising the effectiveness of teaching assistants and could help TA's improve their pedagogy.

The book could very well be used as a working paper for faculty conferences on the improvement of instruction. If just a few of the notions were accepted, undergraduates would see a number of frustrations removed.

Daniel Callahan, William Scott, and Francis X. Shea have written *The Role of Theology in the University* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967) and have added one more significant document to the growing number of creatively critical statements about religion, the church, and theology. In three long chapters the authors first of all show how theology has become moribund because it did not speak to reality as laymen perceive it. Theology partly through its own fault and partly through the impact of the Enlightenment, and subsequently intellectual movements, stopped being regarded as an important discipline within the university. But because of the contemporary climate for change within the church, theology now faces the potentiality of again dealing with real concerns and being accepted as one of the major disciplines of the university.

All three chapters are well ordered and cleanly stated. The essay "Theology as an Academic Discipline" by Francis X. Shea is a gem of its kind. Shea's argument for inclusion of theology in the university is almost Deweyan in its pragmatism. For example, "It follows from all of this that the form of truth is a process; a development, an evolution perhaps, but always at least, a movement. If no concept can be total as the experience out of which it arises is total, then it must be succeeded by a corrective concept. Dialectic, then, is the shape of living knowledge." But in addition to his argument, which is cogent, Shea's language is a delight. For example, "It would be bitterly ironical that theology should be faulted for being the only discipline to recognize the truth about its own methods." "Acceptance is all the verification a theory needs, wants, or can find."

That such a collection of essays could be written by churchmen is truly indicative of the growing openness within institutionalized religion.

Stanley Elam and William P. McLure have edited *Educational Requirements for the 1970's* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1967). This reviewer's initial reaction to this collection of papers given at a Phi Delta Kappa symposium at the University of Illinois was distinctly unfavorable. Solon T. Kimball, writing as a sociologist, seemed to over-elaborate the obvious, which is that education to be optimumly effective must be consistent with other parts of a culture, and he reached the not surprising conclusion that some of contemporary education seemed faulty because it was out of step with the times.

This initial recoil, however, dissipated as the other chapters began to unfold. In those the very real problems of establishing manpower policy, of increased federal involvement in educational policy, of the relationship between education and economic growth were exposed and elaborated. This elaboration seemed polarized around a search for making education effective for the culturally disadvantaged or the culturally different. In all of its starkness the question is raised in several different ways as to whether the society is willing to do those things which can provide the Negro community a proportionate share of America's affluence.

John Folger brought the full discussion into sharp focus in a brief summary chapter. This statement alone makes the book of worth.

The major caveat with the volume or the symposium is that several relevant disciplines were not included. A sociologist speaks, as do several economists. A student of public administration might have dealt better with such problems as whether a lay board of control is viable. Then, too, there might have been persons who had direct experience with some of the examples to test just how valid the examples were. For example, Folger is much more favorable to some of the federally supported R and D centers than experience would warrant. Except for the transcripts of discussion which tend to drag, the book serves a useful purpose of forcing thoughts about education to be placed in a much broader social and economic context.

Two smaller books or booklets are Lewis B. Mayhew's *The Collegiate Curriculum: An Approach to Analysis* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1966), and Harold W. Stoke's *Viewpoints For the Study of Administration of Higher Education* (Eugene, Ore.: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1966). They each are reflections of the authors on subjects which have involved them for a number of years. The Mayhew volume stands in direct continuation of the theories of Ralph W. Tyler, Beardsly Ruml, and Earl McGrath, and attempts to suggest how faculties can go about the building of the curriculum. The Stoke volume stands in continuation of the school of thought which assigns great power to a president and assumes an inevitable conflict between faculty and administration. Of the two, for obvious reasons this reviewer is somewhat partial to the Mayhew effort.

An important book, although poorly organized, is Albert Broderick's (ed.) *Law and the Liberal Arts* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967). It presents the papers and discussions of a conference held to explore several evolving problems. The first is the need for the social and behavioral sciences to infiltrate professional legal training, and the second is the need for people, as part of their general or liberal education, to have some grounding in the law. Generally the descriptions of courses in the arts having relevance for the law were clear. Generally the exploration of issues of such things as the proper uses of the law faculty were appropriate. But the continuity was disturbed by reprinting discussion—which is hard to follow when physically present at a meeting and doubly hard to follow in the cold light of print. Still the book is the best we presently have.

Lawrence Siegel has edited *Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967). It is a strange book which might better have been two. The resumés of theory all seem clear, sound, and very likely helpful to students who must learn them to pass an examination in educational psychology. They all, however, reinforce, either implicitly or explicitly, the thesis advanced by one of the contributors that ". . . it is interesting to note how infrequently teaching procedures reflect what psychologists are supposed to know about how humans learn, remember, and generalize." But in the final chapter Professor Siegel seems to argue that there are a great many things now known which are either being used in teaching or soon will be. This reviewer finds the last chapter of considerable help for the real problems of education, the other he finds of only mild interest and of scant assistance.

In stark contrast stands Wayne C. Booth's edited volume *The Knowledge Most Worth Having* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967). These are the papers presented at a five-day conference on liberal arts held at the University of Chicago as part of its 75th anniversary celebration.

The men who gave the papers have thought long about the substance of undergraduate education and seriously probe the old and on occasion a new issue. Dean Booth believes that a college can prescribe the sort of knowledge all men should have, and that it should involve nature, speculation, awareness of art, and awareness of himself. Professor Ward believes that in some form or other a prescribed general education can be exported even to British-oriented Indian universities. Professor Frye sees two bodies of knowledge—mythology and science. One can survive without knowledge of science, but not man's view of himself and the world, which comprise the mythology. But others at the conference are not prescriptive. John R. Platt argues that diversity is the essence of modern life, and each person should be allowed to pursue those things which preoccupy him. He especially believes that the college should be organized at a more leisurely pace, so that students can really explore what intrigues. In spite of critics who believe that the undergraduate college has become only a preparatory school for graduate students, Edward Levi believes that the undergraduate college within a university can and should have a mission which it should pursue. Thus, in the final chapter he provides a defense for the college of the University of Chicago which, after all, did convene the conference.

The papers clearly do not comprise a balanced work on the curriculum. But they do say in clear tones that the purposes and goals of general education are very much alive and that the age of specialization has not become all-pervasive.

The American Council on Education once again has served the profession well by publishing the background papers for and many of the papers and addresses given at its annual convention. *Improving College Teaching* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967), edited by Calvin B. T. Lee, deals with the academic community, the academic man, the quantity and quality of college teachers, teaching and learning, the evaluation of teaching, and curriculum reform. The papers clearly reveal how little and how much we know about the practice of collegiate education. In general the background papers are reasonably thorough and present both solid evidence as well as seasoned opinion. Thus Allan Cartter reaches the conclusion that the gap between supply and demand for college teachers may be closing, and that the market will be considerably softer in the 1970's than in the 1960's. W. J. McKeachie takes a second look at the teaching possibilities of some of the new media and innovations, and in the light of recent research is inclined to support the conventional wisdom of the values of small classes and the like. And John Gustad finds that, although not much is known about the evaluation of teaching, enough experience has been accumulated to make him sanguine that improvement of assessment is possible. Samuel Baskin elaborates his thesis that innovation is possible and is in fact taking place through independent study, application of technology to education, new curricular patterns, and the like.

All of this is sound stuff. It is in the delivered papers that one finds such an extreme range from the profound to the silly, and from the highly styled to the platitudinous. William Arrowsmith's now famous sermon would have us believe that the university as a center of education or as a preparer of teachers is total loss and no insurance. And he may be right. But then one finds another paper consisting of virtually every cliché in the college president's handbook—"Administration . . . has a responsibility for quality control," "Education has a product," "Administration . . . must assume the maintenance of high quality instruction," "Schools of education are currently in disrepute . . .," and ". . . professors have convinced each other that they are unique." The book is so generally excellent that one wishes the editor had been a little more ruthless. Some with Olympian names still speak nonsense.

Foundations

RALPH L. NELSON has prepared *The Investment Policies of Foundations* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967), and it fills a needed gap in the literature. It makes the point that while foundations seemingly are of large significance in American life and especially in American education, they are really of relatively recent origin. Most of the large ones either were created or received the bulk of their funds within the last 30 years. Although their assets seem large, $17 billion in 1960, and their contributions great, $850 million a year, in comparison to other elements they are modest. Annual giving is only one-sixth of one percent of the gross national product.

Generally the investment policies of foundations are conservative and perpetuate the form of the original grants they received. Typically founders gave large blocks of stocks in companies in which they gained their wealth, and the foundations have maintained these holdings. As compared with mutual funds and pension funds, foundations have been much less aggressive in the stock market and have been inclined against diversification of holdings. The author is inclined to favor diversification of holdings, but recognizes that existing foundation policies have been reasonably productive.

For obvious reasons, the Ford Foundation is not included in aggregate figures. Its holdings are so much larger than even combinations of other large foundations that its inclusion would only distort averages. Yet it does conform to the general pattern of investment policies.

One would hope that Congressmen and others who see the foundations as sinister combines having enormous power to affect the morality of the American people would read this book to realize first just how limited are foundation resources and how really consistent to conservative financial values they are.

Another contribution to the same general field is Wilder Penfield's *The Difficult Art of Giving: The Epic of Alan Gregg* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1967). Alan Gregg spent the productive part of his career as a staff member at the Rockefeller Foundation, aiding it in making grants for the improvement of medicine, health services, and health education throughout the world. He apparently was happy only when he was in the field finding out what the facts about the world health situation really were. His talent lay in possessing an enormous fund of knowledge about on-going research and his ability to judge men who had the ability to make important contributions. He operated on the principle that a grade-A man with a grade-B idea was a better risk than the converse.

As biography the book is a little on the long side, with perhaps too much detail being given to early years. Also, it is a little too praising. Humans just are not all that good. And some of the long discussions about places such as Colorado Springs seem difficult to justify. What commends the book is an insight into how principles of foundation giving have evolved.

A Mixed Lot

NOT RECOMMENDED for bedside reading is the nine-pound, 1,550-page *Educational Systems of Africa,* prepared by Martena Sasnett and Inez Lepmeyer (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967). It is an attempt to provide detailed information about each of the African systems of education, so that registrars and admissions people may make more rational judgments in evaluating academic credentials. It is part of a larger project which will eventually allow the international academic community to have up-to-date information about institutions in six regions of the world.

The format is simple. The nations of each of the nine regions of Africa provide the framework for presenting historical sketches, geographical identification, and then precise information regarding curricular requirements, degrees offered, and composition of faculties for each institution. The offset printing, which in other sorts of books might jar or detract, in this one contributes to ease of reading. Further, the language is sparse and bare but not cryptic, hence can be well used by those familiar with educational nomenclature. It is a pleasure to find a no-nonsense reference work produced to help solve a growing problem which is designed for the convenience of the user.

Susan Millman and Richard E. Nisbett have prepared *Graduate Record Examination Psychology Advanced Test* (New York: Arco, 1967). This purports to be a guide to preparation for the Graduate Record Examination published by the Educational Testing Service. To the extent that the sample questions are similar to those found in the test, the collection has validity, although a number of the questions are poorly formulated. But to the extent that students studying these questions can prepare for the GRE, some serious questions can be raised. In two major studies it has been reasonably well established that coaching for the Scholastic Aptitude Test does not improve performance. One could theorize that the same point could be made for coaching for the GRE. The homiletics about how to take exams are innocuous enough and might help students if they take them seriously.

Addendum

IN ADDITION to all of these, a number of other books should at least be listed to reflect the full output of literature about higher education during 1967. The fact that a book is included in this section for abbreviated treatment should in no way be considered a reflection on the quality of the book, either positively or negatively. It's just that the flow of books during 1967 seemed to reach floodtide proportions, which just did not allow time for more extended comment. In the field of history, three more books should be noted: Leslie L. Hanawalt prepared a history of Wayne State University called *A Place of Light* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967) as one of the activities of the centennial celebration. It appears to be one of the more lucidly written institutional histories, and the author has made a serious attempt to relate institutional development with the socioeconomic contexts within which they occur. Wayne State, as is well known, derived originally from a medical school; acquired complex form through assimilation of several municipally supported educational efforts; developed great strength during the Depression decade as a prototype street car college; and has now emerged since becoming a state university as a complex institution traveling the primrose path to academic excellence designed as an emphasis on graduate and professional study and research. The chief fault of the book is endemic for institutional histories—an over-preoccupation with names of individuals treated so sparsely that the full significance of the person never comes through.

The second history is Howard H. Peckham's *The Making of the University of Michigan, 1817-1967* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967). This is another anniversary publication, this time the sesquicentennial celebration of the University. The author attempts almost a grid sort of analysis, focusing for one dimension on the three functions of a contemporary university: teaching, research, and service; and, for the other dimension, focusing on the influence the various presidents have had in shaping the institution. Such a device, of course, is not without dangers, for the author had to treat the retiring President Hatcher as he did other presidents from the past, but without the opportunity for objectivity which could buttress judgments about those long dead. Perhaps the most important contribution is the long chapter chronicling the maturation of President Tappan's notions of a university. Tappan, it will be recalled, was one of that generation enchanted by the German university who wanted to import the concept to the United States.

The third of this group is a publication of the Proceedings of the Convention of Friends of Agricultural Education in 1871, under the title *An Early View of the Land Grant Colleges* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967). The University of Illinois has wisely elected to publish several collections of documents dealing with the background of land grant education as a way of celebrating its centennial. The Convention, which met in 1871, addressed itself to three themes: experimental methods in agriculture, administrative problems and difficulties facing college administration, and the need for a continuing organization of representatives of the industrial colleges. It is good to have a permanent record of this indigenously American phenomenon.

Under the general heading of "Miscellaneous Essays and Opinion" are 10 other books. The Bobbs Merrill Company, Indianapolis, has published six paperback collections of essays, for the most part thoughtfully written and all having distinct relevance for higher education. The titles are: *Dialogue on*

Education, Dialogue on Youth, Dialogue on Psychology, Dialogue on Women, and *Dialogue on Poverty*.

Alexander S. Preminger has selected and edited speeches and essays of Harry D. Giddeonse and published them under the title, *Against the Running Tide* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1967). Over the years since Harry Giddeonse was a brilliant teacher at the University of Chicago to the time when he retired as president of Brooklyn College, he has been an eloquent spokesman for liberal education, and the eloquence does come through in most of the essays. It is a substantial cut above most such accumulations of presidential utterances.

Kenneth D. Benne has published *Education for Tragedy* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967). In the essays the author attempts to elaborate the crisis situation in which modern man finds himself, and attempts to prescribe, chiefly through the contrivance of more effective interpersonal and intergroup relationships. The author feels that we no longer can rely on nondeliberate processes of historical selection to restore community among men, where it is eroded or eclipsed. We must as men deliberately organize and plan for building and maintaining community of choice and action where community has been threatened or lost, if cultural crisis is not to become cultural disintegration.

M. Blaug, M. H. Peston, and A. Ziderman report on *The Utilization of Educated Manpower in Industry* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967). This is a report of a research project designed to formulate and test relationships between the economic characteristics of individual firms and the educational profiles of their labor force, with the ultimate practical purpose of throwing light on the factors affecting the requirement for people with different educational qualifications. This is clearly a pilot study and makes important methodological contributions, but also several significant substitute conclusions. For the advocates of broad educational experience, one of these is particularly heartening. "Although we have not been able to ascertain optimal educational requirements, we have been able to establish both that the same occupation is staffed by people of varying background and experience and also that it is not the case that one particular education experience requirement stands out as obviously appropriate for each occupation. This, of course, also makes the need for manpower planning slightly less pressing."

John Curtis Gowan, George D. Demos, and E. Paul Torrance have edited *Creativity in Educational Implications* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967). It represents an attempt to help educators assimilate some of the growing literature about creativity so that they may in turn actually contrive educational experiences to enhance creativity in students. These essays underscore the thesis that people need supportive guidance if they are going to perform creatively; but these supportive efforts are not mysterious; they require the time-honored traits of teaching, energy, courage, wisdom, patience, and originality. It is an optimistic book.

Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson have produced *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966). This is a collection of descriptions of programs of compensatory educational effort for Negro students, ranging from preschool to the college year. The entire tenor of the book is captured in a critique of the efforts having been made. "Probably the most significant change, or at least the one with the most serious implications for education, will be the change that requires the schools to shift away from an emphasis on simply rewarding the successful student. The emphasis will have to fall instead on the school's responsibility for insuring success in academic, emotional, and social learning for all students save a very few who are truly mentally defective. The future will also demand of us that we abandon our focus on more and more content mastery and substitute for it a primary focus on learning to learn as a continuous process through life. A particular help is the Directory of Compensatory Practices included in the almost 100-page Appendix. The section on compensatory efforts of colleges and universities is the most complete listing presently available.

Education and World Affairs continues its important task of informing the professional audience in a remarkable series on *The Professional School and World Affairs* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967). The organization reports on the reciprocal impact between the professional schools and international affairs. Recognizing that the professional schools of the United States are going through a period of growth and ferment, Education and World Affairs attempted to assess current trends and future prospects of the professional schools in the problems of the outside world. The titles in the series are: *The Professional School and World Affairs: Medicine and Public Health; The Professional School and World Affairs: Agriculture and Engineering; The Professional School and World Affairs: Law; The Professional School and World Affairs: Business Administration;* and *The Professional School and World Affairs: Education.* In spite of these being reports of task forces, the reports are remarkably readable.

John W. Masland writes of *Educational Development in Africa: The Role of United States Assistance* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967). This is a brief summary version of a series of studies of manpower needs and educational institutional capabilities in a number of African countries. The authors generally conclude that the record of U. S. assistance to African educational development has been impressive and has been influential in the significant expansion of educational systems all across the African continent; but African education now stands at a crossroads, the proper choice of which will require African authorities to think in terms of long-range effects.

Richard A. Humphrey has edited *Universities and Development Assistance Abroad* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967). In this collection of essays written by people with long experience in international education, an attempt is made to reflect upon the future of international education in the light of the experience of 20 years of exchange and development assistance overseas. In just 15 years the United States Government has discovered that American universities are a powerful instrument for change in underdeveloped countries. Until the present, this educational aid has been conceived of as a one-way flow of effort which was made largely on the basis of faith. Now, however, attempts are being made to assess the full impact of various programs, and to evolve a more cooperative responsibility between the aiding and developing nations.

Richard A. Crabbs and Frank W. Holmquist have prepared a partially annotated bibliography on *United States Higher Education and World Affairs* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967). The bibliography spans the field of the different types of involvement of the United States higher education with world affairs. Generally, the annotations are descriptive rather than critical; but, even so, bringing much fugitive information together is an important contribution to this domain of scholarship.

Ole B. Thomsen writes of *Some Aspects of Education in Denmark*

(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967). This is one more of the important contributions which the University of Toronto Press has been regularly producing over the last 18 to 24 months. In some respects Canada at the present is far out-producing the United States in significant works on higher education. The last two essays in the book focus on post-secondary education and adult education, which serve as effective documents in the comparative study of universities. Perhaps the most interesting strain which runs through these several essays is the drift of European higher education toward techniques originally devised in the American context. While in the past Danish universities have treated students in quite a *laissez faire* manner, currently they are making vigorous efforts to establish guidance and advising services in an effort to cut down on the high (50 percent) attrition rate of freshmen.

Three books deal with newer media and instructional resources. Allen E. Koenig and R. B. Hill have edited *The Farther Vision: Educational Television Today* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967). The history of the development of educational television, the story of the relationships between educational stations and the networks, the patterns of closed circuit television, the preparation of educational television personnel, and some estimates about the future of educational television comprise the bulk of this collection. The rose-colored glasses of the contributors are well revealed in the summary statement that "although ETV may have been characterized until this point in time as having more problems than promise, the future of ETV as a dominant electronic medium affecting many millions of people throughout the world seems bright enough for the editors to close on a note of supreme optimism."

Charles J. McIntyre and John B. Haney report on a USOE sponsored project under the title, *Planning for Instructional Resources at a Rapidly Growing Urban University* (Chicago: University of Illinois, 1967). The study had the objectives of identifying critical problem areas in university instruction to which the full application of instructional resources could make a significant contribution; to test forms of administrative encouragement to faculty to make use of those resources; and to identify needed changes in curricula and methods for their most effective use. The research is largely descriptive, with information provided by departments on the Chicago campus; but the work should be of value for any institution seriously wishing to institutionalize the administration of some of these new media.

George W. Brown, James J. Miller, and Thomas A. Keenan have edited *Edunet* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967). This is a collection of papers and proceedings of a summer effort to discover if some nationwide system of media, ranging from computer to color television, could be worked out. The underlying concept accepted by the editors is that resource-sharing among educational institutions aimed at making the educational establishment more effective and more efficient is an imperative and is quite possible. The book is a little bit difficult to grasp, partly because of some addiction to jargon suffered by the editors.

Three books deal generally with the curriculum. B. Lemar Johnson has edited one more of the occasional reports from the Junior College Leadership Program of the University of California at Los Angeles, under the title *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-door College* (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles Junior Leadership Program, 1967), which contains papers delivered at a conference. These papers follow the quite orthodox pattern of talking of the glories of the junior college and then getting to the heart of the matter, which are descriptive papers indicating how several institutions have used new media to solve certain kinds of instructional problems. Perhaps the most frightening portion of the book is an enthusiastic essay by John E. Tirrell as to how Oakland Community College has embraced the new technology throughout the institution. One would hope that such experiments are subsequently subjected to rigorous research testing.

Gordon O. Wilbur and Norman C. Pendered have written *Industrial Arts in General Education* (Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1967), a revision of an earlier textbook prepared for college classes dealing with the teaching of industrial arts. It is premised on the unique notion that industrial arts is an essential part of general education. But while the authors make a case that experience in industrial arts is probably good for people, the argument that it is general education in the sense that term is usually used just doesn't come off.

Seymour L. Wolfbein has written *Education and Training for Full Employment* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967). The author attempts to argue the thesis that education and training in the 1960's can be meaningfully differentiated from previous developments in educational history, partly because of three matching revolutions which have taken place since World War II. First, there has been a major revolution in economic policy designed to spur increases in spending and investment. Second, there are the changes in manpower policy, exemplified by such things as the MDTA. And third, there is the revolution in the kinds of work the labor force performs, the income it makes, and the relationships between that work and income. This is reflected by the fact that a majority of American workers are now engaged in service-producing industries and in white collar rather than blue collar occupations. The author argues the thesis that everyone can be trained, should be trained, and that techniques for appropriate teaching and guidance are now available. Much of the evidence is anecdotal and descriptive, but the evidence is revealing as to just how wide a variety of activities is currently being attempted. Once again time will be required to fully validate the efforts.

Under the broadly construed rubric of administration are four documents. In the first, Edward A. Shea and Elton E. Wieman discuss "*Administrative Policies for Intercollegiate Athletics* (Springfield, Ill.; Charles C. Thomas, 1967). The authors obviously assume that intercollegiate athletics have a legitimate place in the educational program of higher education, and that this being so, basic policies and guidelines with some normative power can be established. If one can accept the basic premise, the basic adjusted policies possess an internal consistency and general acceptance at at least the policy level. For example, the control of athletics should be held absolutely and completely by those directly responsible for the institution. Each institution should clearly state in its catalog the reason for its program of intercollegiate athletics. The department of athletics should have a place in the institutional structure comparable to that of any other department. Members of the athletic department should have the same status as other faculty members, similar in tenure and in methods of appointment to other faculty members of comparable rank. Athletic teams should be composed of bona fide students who are attracted to the institution by its educational program. The authors attempt to portray reality, but one can wonder whether they have thoroughly explored the dimensions of these highly commendable policy statements.

Galen N. Drewry has edited *The Administrative Team and Long-range Planning* (Athens, Ga.: Institute of Higher Education, 1967). This slim booklet contains papers presented at a summer conference concerned with the administrative team leadership. For the most part the papers are somewhat overgeneralized. One has the feeling that the values came not from the presentations themselves but from the discussions which these brief homilies sparked. Illustrative of the level of generality is the statement, "Academic planning is not the decision of 'to change or not to change' but of how to change; and academic planning does not deal with nebulous abstracts such as excellence or even arts and science. It is concerned with the educator and educated in concrete terms. As Pogo has said: "We have met the enemy and they is us.' "

The Southern Regional Education Board has produced *Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967), one of the many useful documents which SREB prepares annually.

Clarence A. Schoenfeld with Donald N. Zillman has filled a needed gap in the literature with *The American University in Summer* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967). The authors trace the origins of the summer school movement, and then provide a good bit of normative data as well as informed opinion regarding such things as kinds of students, faculty salaries, types of programs, and the like characterizing summer sessions. A look to the future suggests that increasingly American institutions are moving toward year-round operation.

Richard L. Desmond wrote *Higher Education and Tax-motivated Giving* (Washington, D. C.: The American College Public Relations Association, 1967). It reports a study tracing the federal tax history of life income gifts to colleges and universities from the passage of the 16th Amendment in 1913 to the present. While in the past colleges have been guilty of over-promotion of the life income trust or gift, it appears that the worst of college excesses are over, and it is probable that life income gifts are currently in a position to produce both large deferred gifts and increased current support to those colleges which promote them steadily and wisely.

Three more books deal with religion, or religion in higher education. The first is George N. Shuster's *Catholic Education in a Changing World* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967). In view of a variety of forces, especially Vatican II, the conclusion is inescapable. Older forms of criticism of Catholic education are for the most part outmoded. To be worth its salt, comment must henceforth be concerned not with what is static, but with what is dynamic in that education; and the arena within which Catholic education will function in the future is described well in the author's own words, "The era when education beyond the elementary school has become almost universal has created a new religion. This has its own great basilicas which are the universities. They profess conflicting doctrines but subscribe to subtly formulated, widely accepted dogmas based on the assumed infallibility of science. Cults spring up around them, probably more hedonistic than those of antiquity. Above all, the new religion has its miracles which inspire awe and dread alike. The principal saints on its altars are those who have performed the miracles. Seen in its totality the Creed sees to dwarf Christianity in terms both of power and meaning. The Christian sees, of course, that it rests on recognition of the fact that Nature once created was made autonomous by its Creator. It is not within but outside of it. Man is its master and can enrich himself from a treasury which is in fact rather pitifully meager but can seem almost unbounded when compared with the resources ancestral generations had to draw upon. What can Christian or specifically Catholic education do but stand in line for its share of the wealth." But then in the concluding pages the author still says: Yes, there is something other which can be done.

Herbert Stroup has prepared *Church and State in Confrontation* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1967). The book argues the thesis that the pattern of Church-State relationships in the United States has not been a single fabric but composed of a multitude of unique experiences, and the emerging patterns, while possibly threatening to some, are just further extensions of the experimentalism which has characterized the nation since its establishment. As these experiments take place, especially in the light of present discussions of Church-State relations, there is now a necessity and an opportunity for Christians, along with other citizens, to reexamine the precise nature of the basic issues. At least three fundamental needs must be met: a need for new understanding of the Church, a need for new understanding of the State, and a need for openness to new ideas and forms.

Robert W. Lynn in a pamphlet-style book writes of *Education and the New American* (New York: Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches, 1967). The chapters consist of lectures given at the 1966 annual meeting of the Council secretaries and the Department of Higher Education, which attempted to identify issues and problems and to formulate plans and programs to meet emerging needs. In the author's judgment the United States is going through its third major revolution with respect to education, and this revolution, of course, is sparked by the revolution in technology, but epitomized by the centrality of the university in American life. This development runs concurrently with a tendency for Protestant efforts in education in America to become increasingly marginal and peripheral; and Protestantism must find within that margin the dimensions of its new mission.

And then there is a miscellany of books, booklets, and monographs difficult to classify, but essential elements of the panorama. Perhaps the most significant one of these is *The Negro and Higher Education in the South* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967). This reports a year's study of Negro higher education in the South and reflects for perhaps the first time in history the wisdom and judgment of Southerners, Negro and white, about the condition of Negro colleges and universities. Although the document sparked considerable controversy with critical opinions coming both from the Negro community and the segregationist community, the report does seem to be a sober analysis which accepts the necessity for predominantly Negro education for at least several generations ahead, and seeks to find means by which each state can develop a single fabric of higher education which is increasingly sensitive to the needs of the South and increasingly effective. Clearly there must be major improvement of a number of Negro institutions. Here the committee generally resumed the full range of devices for improvement which have become part of the literature of higher education.

Louis C. Vaccaro has edited a short book entitled, *Toward New Dimensions of Catholic Higher Education* (Arlington, Va.: Education Research Associates, 1967). It consists of a series of essays written by a group of Catholic scholars who reflect in their own lives and careers the dilemma of Catholic higher education in general. The intent of the volume is to stir the conscience of those ultimately responsible for the health and vitality of the Catholic college and university in America, but without determining in advance the outcomes of resultant discussions. Thus several of the writers, Catholic in persuasion, can candidly examine the possibility of the complete demise of Catholic education. But while individual authors may take such a stance, the total impact of this slim volume is an expression of hope, hence the title.

Philip C. Chamberlain and Roy B. Schilling, Jr., have written a short monograph on *Private Liberal Arts Colleges and Their Changing Purposes* (Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University, 1967). After reviewing the highlights of the evolution of the liberal arts college in America, the authors arrive at the generalization that the liberal arts college is facing an identity crisis which unfortunately too many institutions are attempting to resolve through a kind of regression toward the mean. There are many who decry the plight of these institutions, but currently there is a dearth of constructive ideas as to how these colleges can redefine their missions.

Maurice L. Litton and W. Hugh Stickler have produced the third supplement to the bibliography on college teaching, under the title, *College Teachers and College Teaching* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967). This is a continuation of a project begun by the late Walter Crosby Eels in 1957 and, in general, maintains the same level of excellence established with the first bibliography. Annotations are for the most part samplings rather than description or assessment. As such, it has value, but one might hope that future supplements might make some evaluations of the worth of the material cited. Knowing at first-hand much of the material, I can only sympathize with the graduate student of the future who must wade through much of the drivel cited.

Joseph Katz has edited *Growth and Constraint in College Students: A Study of the Varieties of Psychological Development* (Stanford: Institute for the Study of Human Problems, 1967). This is likely to become one of the most widely quoted works on higher education and, because of its present formidable size, possibly one of the least read. Essentially, it is a study in depth of samples of students from the University of California at Berkeley and from Stanford University, through their four undergraduate collegiate years. Using sociometric information, interview material, and cast study material, the contributors attempt to understand the dynamics of the contemporary student generation on these two campuses. A number of the results are not too surprising, but some are. For many students there is a lack of congruence between their own motivation and the academic intellectual offerings of the college. Many students do not learn to focus their own reasoning capacities on the problems of their own development. Because of the contrived cognitive tone to the college milieu, many students do not have sufficient opportunity to develop the nonintellective parts of their character, and the college years, because of their pervasiveness and significance, bring many difficult psychological tests and problems to students which are so staggering that many individuals let some or most of them go by default. In its present form the document is a report complying with a contract from the U. S. Office of Education. In an edited form, the book is to be published commercially during the spring of 1968. The book is so significant that one can only hope that the authors will discipline themselves to bring the volume into readable proportions.

And lastly, H. W. Hannah and Robert R. Caughey have compiled *The Legal Base for Universities in Developing Countries* (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1967). The body of the work seems to be of considerably greater significance than a preceding volume. The authors here have actually summarized the substance of legislation dealing with all manner of university problems, and have exercised a minimum of evaluation in the light of the American experience. As such, the main portion appears to be excellent reference material. In a last chapter the authors have attempted to establish norms by indicating what essentials they believe should be in each kind of statute.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambrose, Stephen E. *Duty, Honor, Country: A History of West Point.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

American Association for Higher Education. *Faculty Participation in Academic Governance.* Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1967.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Changing Dimensions in Teacher Education.* Twentieth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1967.

American College Testing Program. *College Student Profiles.* Iowa City, Iowa: the Program, 1967.

American Council on Education. *American Junior Colleges.* Washington, D. C.: the Council, 1967.

Ballard, Phoebe, and Ballard, Todhunter. *The Man Who Stole a University.* Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967.

Bass, Richard D., and Anderson, Roberta, compilers. *Community Junior College: A Bibliography.* Corvallis, Ore.: Division of Continuing Education of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1967.

Benne, Kenneth D. *Education for Tragedy.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Blaug, M.; Peston, M. H.; and Ziderman, A. *The Utilization of Educated Manpower in Industry.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Bobbs Merrill Company. *Dialogue on Education. Dialogue on Youth. Dialogue on Psychology. Dialogue on Women. Dialogue on Poverty.* Paperback collections of essays. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1967.

Booth, Wayne C. (ed.). *The Knowledge Most Worth Having.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Bragdon, Henry Wilkinson. *Woodrow Wilson, the Academic Years.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967.

Brill, Earl H. *Sex Is Dead and Other Postmortems.* New York: The Seabury Press, 1967.

Broderick, Albert (ed.). *Law and the Liberal Arts.* Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967.

Brown, David G. *The Mobile Professors.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Brown, George W.; Miller, James J.; and Keenan, Thomas A. (eds.). *Edunet.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Brumbaugh, A. J. *Establishing New Senior Colleges.* Research Monograph No. 12. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967.

Bushnell, Dan W., and Allen, Dwight W. (eds.). *The Computer in American Education.* New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1967.

Butz, Otto. *To Make a Difference.* New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Caffrey, John, and Mosmann, Charles J. *Computers on Campus.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Callahan, Daniel; Scott, William; and Shea, Francis X. *The Role of Theology in the University.* Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967.

Cantril, Hadley. *The Human Dimension: Experiences in Policy Research.* New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1967.

Chamberlain, Philip C., and Schilling, Roy B., Jr. *Private Liberal Arts Colleges and Their Changing Purposes.* Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University, 1967.

Chambers, M. M. *The Colleges and the Courts 1962-1966*. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers Inc., 1967.

Cooper, William Mansfield, and others. *Governments and the University*. Toronto: MacMillan Co. of Canada, 1966.

Crabbs, Richard A., and Holmquist, Frank W., compilers. *United States Higher Education and World Affairs*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Demerath, N. J.; Stephens, Richard W.; and Taylor, R. R. *Power Presidents and Professors*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.

Desmond, Richard L. *Higher Education and Tax-motivated Giving*. Washington, D. C.: The American College Public Relations Association, 1967.

Drewry, Galen N. *The Administrative Team and Long-range Planning*. Athens, Ga.: Institute of Higher Education, 1967.

Donovan, George F. (ed.). *Vatican Council II: Its Challenge to Education*. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967.

Einstein, Bernice W. *Guide to Success in College*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1967.

Elam, Stanley, and McLure, William P. (eds.). *Educational Requirements for the 1970's*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1967.

Fall, Harold. *Controversy in American Education*. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1967.

Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions. *Accredited Institutions of Higher Education*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, September 1967.

Footlick, Jerrold K. *The College Scene Now*. Silver Spring, Md.: The National Observer, 1967.

Freedman, Mervin B. *The College Experience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967.

Friedlander, Albert H. (ed.). *Never Trust a God Over 30*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Gardner, David P. *The California Oath Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Ginzberg, Eli, and Yohalem, Alice M. *Educated American Women: Self-Portraits*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Glennerster, Howard. *Graduate Study*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Goldstein, Richard. *1 in 7 Drugs on the Campus*. New York: Walker & Co., 1967.

Gordon, Edmund W., and Wilkerson, Doxey A. *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Gorowitz, Samuel (ed.). *Freedom and Order in the University*. Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1967.

Gowan, John Curtis; Demos, George D.; and Torrance, E. Paul (eds.). *Creativity in Educational Implications*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Graubard, Stephen R., editor. "Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress." *Daedalus*. Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. 96, No. 3, Summer 1967.

Grouett, Stephan. *Manhattan Project: The Untold Story of the Making of the Atomic Bomb*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1967.

Hall, John Oliver. *Parsons College: Nine Years of Change 1955-64*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1967.

Hallam, Kenneth J. (ed.). *Innovations in Higher Education*. Baltimore: Towson State College, 1966.

Hanawalt, Leslie L. *A Place of Light.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

Hannah, H. W., and Caughey, Robert R., compilers. *The Legal Base for Universities in Developing Countries.* Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Hartley, Joanne T. (ed.). *Dialogue on Higher Education.* Claremont, Calif.: The Claremont Colleges, 1966.

Hassenger, Robert (ed.). *The Shape of Catholic Higher Education.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Hatch, Richard A. (ed.). *Some Founding Papers of the University of Illinois.* Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Education, Interaction and Social Change.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Horn, D. B. *A Short History of the University of Edinburgh, 1556-1889.* Edinburgh: The University Press, 1967.

Humphrey, Richard A. (ed.). *Universities and Development Assistance Abroad.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Jenkins, Daniel. *The Educated Society.* London: Taber and Taber, 1966.

Johnson, B. Lemar (ed.). *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-door College.* Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, Junior College Leadership Program, 1967.

Joughin, Louis (ed.). *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Katz, Joseph. *Growth and Constraint in College Students: A Study of the Varieties of Psychological Development.* Stanford: Institute for the Study of Human Problems, 1967.

Knoell, Dorothy M. *Toward Educational Opportunity for All.* Albany: Office of the Executive Dean for Two-Year Colleges, State University of New York, 1967.

Koenig, Allen E., and Hill, R. B. (eds.). *The Farther Vision: Educational Television Today.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Lee, Calvin B. T. (ed.). *Improving College Teaching.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Litton, Maurice L., and Stickler, W. Hugh, compilers. *College Teachers and College Teaching.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther, and Estrin, Herman A. (eds.). *The American Student and His College.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.

Lovejoy, Clarence E. *Lovejoy's College Guide 1967.* New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1967.

Luthan, Fred. *The Faculty Promotion Process.* Iowa City: Bureau of Business and Economic Research, 1967.

Lynn, Robert W. *Education and the New American.* New York: Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches, 1967.

Manier, Edward, and Houck, Jack (eds.). *Academic Freedom and the Catholic University.* Notre Dame, Ind.: Tides Publishing Co., 1967.

Masland, John W. *Educational Development in Africa: The Role of United States Assistance.* New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967.

Mayhew, Lewis B. (ed.). *Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades.* Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1967.

Mayhew, Lewis B. *The Collegiate Curriculum: An Approach to Analysis.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1966.

McGrath, Earl J. (ed.). *Selected Issues in College Administration*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

McGrath, Earl (ed.). *The Liberal Arts College's Responsibility for the Individual Student*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

McIntyre, Charles J., and Haney, John B. *Planning for Instructional Resources at a Rapidly Growing Urban University*. Chicago: University of Illinois, 1967.

McLaughlen, Sister M. Raymond. *Religious Education and the State*. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1967.

Menashe, Louis, and Radosh, Ronald (eds.). *Teach-in U.S.A*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Millman, Susan, and Nisbett, Richard E. *Graduate Record Examination Psychology Advanced Test*. New York: Arco, 1967.

Minter, W. John (ed.). *Campus and Capitol*. Boulder, Col.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966.

National Council of Churches. *The Study of Religion in College and University*. New York: Department of Higher Education, the Council, 1967.

Nelson, Ralph L. *The Investment Policies of Foundations*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Patterson, Franklin, and Longsworth, Charles R. *The Making of a College*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Pattillo, Manning M., Jr., and Mackenzie, Donald M. *Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Paulsen, F. Robert (ed.). *American Education: Challenges and Images*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1967.

Paulsen, F. Robert (ed.). *Contemporary Issues in American Education*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1967.

Peckham, Howard H. *The Making of the University of Michigan, 1817-1967*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1967.

Penfield, Wilder. *The Difficult Art of Giving: The Epic of Alan Gregg*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1967.

Preminger, Alexander S. (ed.). *Against the Running Tide*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1967.

Pusey, Nathan M., and Taylor, Charles L. *Ministry for Tomorrow*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1967.

Rader, Benjamin G. *The Academic Mind and Reform*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Rarig, Emory W., compiler. *The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Rimmer, Robert H. *The Harrad Experiment*. New York: Bantam Books, 1966.

Sanford, Nevitt. *Where Colleges Fail*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., 1967.

Sasnett, Martena, and Lepmeyer, Inez. *Educational Systems of Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Schoenfeld, Clarence A., and Zillman, Donald N. *The American University in Summer*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Schueler, Herbert; Lesser, Gerald S.; and Dobbins, Allen L. *Teacher Education and the New Media*. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

Shea, Edward A., and Wieman, Elton E. *Administrative Policies for Intercollegiate Athletics*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.

Shuster, George N. *Catholic Education in a Changing World*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Siegel, Lawrence (ed.). *Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1967.

Snavely, Tipton R. *The Department of Economics at the University of Virginia 1825-1956*. Charlottesville, Va.: The University of Virginia Press, 1967.

Southern Regional Education Board. *Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South*. Atlanta: the Board, 1967.

Southern Regional Education Board. *The Negro and Higher Education in the South*. Atlanta: the Board, 1967.

Spackman, W. M. *On the Decay of Humanism*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1967.

Sparrow, John. *Mark Pattison and the Idea of a University*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Stoke, Harold W. *Viewpoints for the Study of Administration of Higher Education*. Eugene, Ore.: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1966.

Stratton, Julius A. *Science and the Educated Man*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Stroup, Herbert. *Church and State in Confrontation*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1967.

Temple, Willard. *That Old College Try*. New York: Crown Publishers Inc., 1967.

The Centennial Record of the University of California. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

The Professional School and World Affairs. Titles in the series include: *Medicine and Public Health; Agriculture and Engineering; Law; Business Administration;* and *Education*. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967.

Thomsen, Ole B. *Some Aspects of Education in Denmark*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Thresher, B. Alden. *College Admissions and the Public Interest*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Undergraduate Instruction in Arts and Science. Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Instruction in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

University of Illinois. *An Early View of the Land Grant Colleges*. Proceedings of the Convention of Friends of Agricultural Education in 1871. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Vaccaro, Louis C. *Toward New Dimensions of Catholic Higher Education*. Arlington, Va.: Education Research Associates, 1967.

Walton, Stephen. *No Transfer*. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1967.

Weinberg, Alvin M. *Reflections on Big Science*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Weiss, Paul. *The Making of Men*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.

Westin, Alan F. *Privacy and Freedom*. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

Westoff, Charles F., and Patvin, Raymond H. *College Women and Fertility Values*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Wiggins, Sam P. *Higher Education in the South*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1966.

Wilbur, Gordon O.; and Pendered, Norman C. *Industrial Arts in General Education*. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1967.

Williamson, E. G., and Cowan, John L. *Freedom of Expression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

Wolfbein, Seymour L. *Education and Training for Full Employment*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.